

Appendix

Overlooking the Needy at Home

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES A. HALEY

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 1, 1961

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I wish to place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial which appears in the Lakeland Ledger on Thursday, July 27, entitled "Overlooking the Needy at Home."

At this time when we are spending the American taxpayers' money to assist so many of the so-called backward nations, it seems to me that we should take a good look in our own front yard. Certainly we need to take care of some of the responsibilities that are justly ours—such as the needs of the American Indian. The editorial which follows refers specifically to our Indians:

OVERLOOKING THE NEEDY AT HOME

Today a greater proportion of American Indians vote, seek office, go to school, enjoy good health and attain certain marks of accomplishment and status than ever before in U.S. history.

Nevertheless the 300 reservations where live some 360,000 Indians still bear strong resemblances to those underdeveloped lands we commit ourselves to aid beyond our shores.

The Indian lifespan is just two-thirds that of other Americans, and infant mortality rates run three times as high.

Among Indians 25 years and older the median education level is half that of the general U.S. population. Tens of thousands are not trained to hold good jobs even if they could find them.

Throughout most Indian territory substandard, waterless huts abound, though often electric current which could bring more modern facilities stands within easy reach.

Economic development—agricultural, commercial, industrial—lags badly nearly everywhere. On one reservation, 108,000 potentially productive acres produce not a cent of income for their countless Indian owners. Water rights, vital to Indian as to other lands in much of the West, are vaguely defined and loosely protected.

These are but samples, part measure of the task perceived by Interior Secretary Udall's task force on Indian Affairs in its newly completed survey.

What the group proposes is something like the kind of development program favored for foreign aid plans, with heavy stress on better schooling, vocational training and placement, and infusions of outside capital to develop areas and draw in industry.

The task force likewise would slow down and make easier and more careful the Indians' transition from dependency to independence. There exists widespread Indian fear and distrust of the Federal policy symbolized by the one long word, "termination."

That policy, fixed by a 1953 congressional resolution, called for all deliberate speed in freeing Indians from their Federal wardship. Congress and others have become aroused over an Indian program which cost \$160 mil-

lion this year, \$1 billion in the last 10. The rising Indian population has been a further spur.

Yet time and somewhat dismal experience with "termination" at big reservations in Oregon and Wisconsin cast the policy into question. To the Indians it means homelessness, deeper poverty than before, yielding Federal protection and getting no other.

Though the recommended development program probably promises no more than a slow uphill pull, no wiser course is in sight. Surely the help we are urged to give to millions overseas we cannot withhold from hundreds of thousands of Americans—citizens all.

Berlin: Alternative to Nuclear War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH S. CLARK

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 1, 1961

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an advertisement published in the Washington Post and Times Herald of Thursday, July 20, 1961, on the Berlin question, by a number of distinguished Americans. While I do not necessarily agree with the proposed solution of the Berlin problems set forth in the advertisement, I think it raises questions which should be seriously considered and debated by the American people, and that it proposes a solution to the Berlin question which I hope the State Department and the President will seriously consider. As the debate on the Berlin question proceeds, it becomes more apparent to me that while we must all support the President in his proposal for rearmament—and I do categorically and completely—nonetheless we must search the continent for peaceful solutions to the problem which will leave the people of West Berlin in freedom and yet prevent the holocaust of nuclear war.

There being no objection, the advertisement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BERLIN: THERE IS AN ALTERNATIVE TO NUCLEAR WAR

Berlin could touch off a nuclear war.

Mr. Khrushchev has stated his terms. He knows these terms are unacceptable to the West. He has said he will not be dislodged or bluffed out of his position by force or the threat of force.

Mr. Kennedy has rejected Mr. Khrushchev's demands. He has said that the United States will accept no change in the status of East Germany that would jeopardize the independence of West Berlin. He, too, has declared that the United States cannot be intimidated by the threat of nuclear force or the fact of nuclear force.

Thus the unthinkable is no longer unthinkable. Only yesterday leading states-

men warned that force as a means of settling disputes in an atomic age was unthinkable. They made it emphatic that the moment nations turned to nuclear war in pursuit of their objectives they destroyed both the objectives and one another. A single nuclear-tipped missile could carry a special delivery death message for a million people or more. No defense, however ingenious, could be adequate. Hence the clear warning that recourse to war in today's world was in the nature of a suicide pact.

Now, however, a specific test arises and the unthinkables threaten to become the possibles.

The Soviet Union wishes to wait no longer in settling the questions about Germany that were deferred at the end of the Second World War. In the absence of agreement among the victorious powers, Germany was temporarily divided into occupation zones. Berlin, the capital, happened to be deep inside the Eastern zone. The temporary arrangement called for Berlin to be divided, with the Western Powers having access through East Germany to West Berlin.

The Soviet Union feels that an indefinite continuation of the temporary arrangement is intolerable. Its probable reasons:

First. East Germany has been hemorrhaging. Every week, thousands of scientists, doctors, engineers, teachers, farmers, and factory workers are fleeing to West Germany through the Berlin gateway. The economy of East Germany is under increasing strain because of the constant loss of vital manpower.

Second. West Berlin is a glittering showcase for the free world inside the world of the Soviet satellites. No comparison in the modern world is more striking than is to be found today between West and East Berlin.

Third. And most important, the Soviet Union has become severely apprehensive about the remilitarization of Western Germany and is seeking leverage on the Western powers to keep such militarization from going too far.

The United States, Great Britain, and France are eager to maintain the showcase. They have made binding commitments to West Germany and to the people of West Berlin. They regard German militarization inside NATO as a vital buffer and deterrent against attack from the East.

Faced with this challenge to their national interests, both sides have declared they will hold fast. This means that the nations involved are now on an atomic collision course. This fact is clearly understood by all. Yet neither side wishes the other to assume it is reluctant to risk force. And each has served notice it would not lose its nerve because of the horror of nuclear war.

Thus, far from being a deterrent to war, nuclear weapons have actually accelerated the danger of conflict, since the nations now feel compelled to demonstrate they will have no hesitation to use them wherever their vital interests are directly involved.

All these facts in the current crisis over Berlin are relevant, but one fact is dominant. The United States and the Soviet Union may insist on the sovereign right to wage war against each other on the issue of Berlin, or any other, but neither has the right to wage war against the human race in the pursuit of its national goals.

The central meaning of atomic war today is that it is impossible to engage in a major nuclear exchange without killing millions of

people outside the warring powers. The radioactive poisons pumped into the air in a major nuclear war would condemn or imperil all living creatures throughout most of the northern latitudes.

This raises the most profound moral question to face the American people in their history. How far should they—or anyone else—go in carrying out their national aims? Is a policeman justified in firing into a crowd in an effort to kill a murderer? Is any nation justified in firing into the body of humanity in an effort to kill an enemy?

These are not abstract questions. They cannot be ignored.

No extermination without representation

If mankind is involved, then mankind has a right to be consulted. The issue of Berlin is not just whether the Soviet Union is right or the United States is right. The issue is whether there should be extermination without representation; whether the contending nations have the right to proceed without regard for the lives and opinion of others.

It will be said that such terrifying eventualities belong to war itself, and the United States has no alternative. But it is not true that no alternative exists. The alternative is action through the United Nations.

The United Nations was created for the purpose of maintaining peace. A threat to peace has now materialized. The Soviet Union has served notice that it intends to take the law into its own hands. The United States need not do the same. The United States can bring the issue of Berlin before the United Nations. It can argue its position in the context of world law. It can attempt to mobilize world public opinion behind a peaceful settlement of the Berlin question.

The only power in the world greater than the power of nuclear force is the power of world public opinion. Not until this power is tapped and put to work can we or anyone else say that there is no alternative but force to Soviet intransigence in Berlin.

Bringing a constructive proposal on Berlin before the United Nations can be part of a much larger effort seeking the fullest possible development of the United Nations itself—to the end that the U.N. can do the job it was created to do in the first place.

That job is to safeguard the peace and serve the cause of human destiny.

ONE SOLUTION THE U.N. SHOULD CONSIDER A Berlin Authority in an arms-free Germany

In going before the U.N., or in direct discussions, the United States can make these specific and constructive proposals. These can provide the minimum assurances that both the West and the Soviet Union can reasonably demand. They point the way to ultimate reintegration of that divided land, without the risk of remilitarization which could once again endanger the West, the Soviet Union, and the world. This solution involves the international supervision of Berlin through a Berlin Authority and the evolution of an arms-free Germany.

A Berlin Authority

While Berlin may be only a part of the German problem, it could hold the key to a solution:

A new Berlin Authority would be formed by the U.N. (or another appropriate international body) with the continued supervision of the Big Four.

The Berlin Authority would supervise the gradual unification of the administration of West and East Berlin, with powers of taxation.

The Authority would maintain access routes to West Germany and would oversee the inspected withdrawal of armed forces of all nations from Berlin, and their replacement by U.N. garrisons.

The Authority would be empowered to secure deficit financing for Berlin from East and West Germany.

The Authority would operate under a guarantee of the city's neutral status by the U.N., NATO, and the Warsaw Pact.

An arms-free Germany

The larger problem of Germany can be approached in a similar way, with the creation by the U.N.—in cooperation with the Big Four—of a German Authority. This would have responsibility to carry out and inspect the following agreements:

The prohibition of nuclear weapons from both East and West Germany.

The withdrawal in stages of all foreign armed forces from all German territory, and their replacement by U.N. garrisons.

The reduction of German military forces to a level useful only to maintain internal order.

The permanent establishment of the German-Polish border at the Oder-Niesse line.

The process of disengagement should include Czechoslovakia and Poland, and perhaps Hungary, Denmark, and Norway. An arms-free central Europe could do much to ease tensions and should be urged as a step toward general, inspected disarmament agreements.

The Big Four need not expect that the Governments of either East or West Germany will be pleased with all aspects of the proposed solution.

Any settlement must be based, not upon wishful thinking, but upon realism regarding the existence of two distinct and different German states today. Thus there is no possibility of reunification of Germany through free elections and self-determination at the present time. Only under international supervision can East and West Germany begin to work out the means of cooperation, interchange, and eventual reintegration or federation. Nothing less will really solve the Berlin problem.

Honorary sponsors: Max Born, Germany; Lord Boyd-Orr, United Kingdom; Martin Buber, Israel; Pablo Casals, Puerto Rico; Brock Chisholm, Canada; Canon L. John Collins, United Kingdom; Francois Mauriac, France; Gunnar Myrdal, Sweden; Phillip Noel-Baker, United Kingdom; C. Rajagopalachari, India; Lord Russell, United Kingdom; Albert Schweitzer, Gabon.

Sponsors: Prof. Gordon W. Allport, James Baldwin, Prof. Stringfellow Barr, Harry Belafonte, Ray Bradbury, Allan M. Butler, M.D.; Dr. Edward U. Condon, Edwin T. Dahlberg, Dr. William Davidson, Helen Gahagan Douglas, Clark M. Elchelberger, Jules Feiffer, Dr. Harold E. Fey, Dr. Harry Emerson Fosdick, Dr. Jerome D. Frank, Dr. Erich Fromm, Rabbi Roland Gittlesohn, Dr. Israel Goldstein, Patrick E. Gorman, Walter Gropius, Gen. Hugh B. Hester, Ira Hirschmann, Hallock Hoffman, Prof. H. Stuart Hughes, Walt Kelly, Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.; Rabbi Edward E. Klein, O. A. Knight, Arnold H. Maremont, Prof. A. H. Maslow, Dr. Seymour Melman, William H. Meyer, Dr. C. Wright Mills, Lewis Mumford, Dr. William F. Neuman, Richard Neutra, Earl D. Osborn, Josephine W. Pomerance, Dr. Charles C. Price, Walter Reuther, Dr. David Riesman, Frank Rosenblum, Robert Ryan, Francis B. Sayre, Dore Schary, Paul A. Schlipf, Dr. Jack Shubert, Dr. James T. Shotwell, Prof. J. David Singer, Lillian Smith, Dr. Ralph Sockman, Dr. Pitirim A. Sorokin, Dr. Edward J. Sparling, Dr. Harold Taylor, Dean Howard Thurman, Louis Untermeyer, Dr. Maurice B. Visscher, Jerry Voorhis, Bruno Walter, Bishop Hazen G. Werner.

Board of directors: Norman Cousins, chairman; Clarence Pickett, cochairman; M. Stanley Livingston, vice chairman; Steve Allen, vice chairman; Max Youngstein, treasurer; William J. Butler, counsel; Albert Bigelow, Rev. Phillips P. Elliott, Eugene Exman, James Farmer, Nathan

Glazer, Rev. James Gordon Gilkey, Jr., Robert Gurney, Jr., Rev. Donald Harrington, Dr. David L. Hill, Rabbi Isidor B. Hoffman, Stanley M. Isaacs, Walter Lear, M.D., Harding Lemay, Lenore G. Marshall, Mrs. Stephanie May, Lawrence S. Mayers, Jr., Orlie Pell, Victor Reuther, Norman Thomas, Dr. Hugh C. Wolfe, Jerry Wurf, Robert Bloom, New York; Peter Charlton, California; Mrs. John Coggeshall, New York; Dorothy Eldridge, New Jersey; L. Harold WeWolf, Massachusetts; Nolan Kerschner, Connecticut; Truman Kirkpatrick, Illinois; Warren Morse, District of Columbia; Paul Olynik, Ohio; Gregory Stone, Missouri; Ethel Taylor, Pennsylvania; Alvin E. Winder, Massachusetts.

Staff: Dr. Homer A. Jacks, executive director; Edward H. Meyerding, associate director; Donald Keys, program director; Sanford Gottlieb, political action director.

Should a Little Child Lead?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. GOODLING

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 1, 1961

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, in 1788 Edward Gibbon completed his book "The Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire." In it he gave five reasons for the fall of that great empire. Points 4 and 5 seem significantly timely and provocative:

4. The building of gigantic armaments when the real enemy was within, the decadence of the people.

5. The decay of religion—faith fading into mere form—losing touch with life and becoming impotent to guide the people.

During this fiscal year the Congress will have appropriated \$45 to \$50 billion for defense. Every member voting for this, does so hoping not one item of armament will ever be used for the purpose for which it is designed. He also knows in this field what we build today is obsolete tomorrow and other than giving us a certain sense of security we receive no return on our investment.

Our greatest investment with the largest potential return lies in our young folks. Are we making it easier or more difficult to secure capital gains and satisfactory return on this most important investment?

I commend the following letter to each Member of the Congress and suggest here is a field of endeavor costing so little which could return so much:

DEAR SIR: You may pay no attention to this question—you may never ever read this letter. I am only a ninth grade high school student, but I would like to know why Congress doesn't pass a law forbidding obscene movies and literature.

Our society seems to be losing its morals. While we are worrying about reaching the moon, testing bombs, etc., I think we should be more interested in our moral and religious standards.

Most of the people in our society go to the movies. And what do they see at most of the movies? Nothing but obscene junk. The plots and scenes are immoral.

Another thing people do to pass their time is read. What do they read? Maga-

zines that are the same as the movies I mentioned above.

I recently heard a sermon called "The Moral Mess," on "The Lutheran Hour." No wonder we have a moral mess. Wouldn't it be better to allow young people, such as myself, to read and see clean, decent things?

Couldn't such a bill be introduced in Congress?

Declaration of War on Reds Could Help To Win Conflict

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN R. PILLION

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 1, 1961

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Speaker, the San Diego Evening Tribune published the following editorial with the heading stated above. It refers to House Joint Resolution 447, introduced on June 12. Identical resolutions sponsored by Representatives HADLEY, PASSMAN, and DULSKI are also pending in the House of Representatives:

The United States is in a war with the international Communist conspiracy.

Why not recognize that blunt fact with a congressional declaration of war, not against any government, but against the actual enemy—the league of 98 Communities Parties in the world?

Congress has been challenged to do that in a joint resolution introduced by Representative JOHN R. PILLION, Republican, of New York. The resolution was referred to the Foreign Affairs Committee.

Will the committee and the Congress do anything about this?

And if not, why not?

These questions are not asked lightly. Nor is PILLION's suggestion a silly one.

What good would a declaration of war on the alliance of Communist Parties do? PILLION lists several practical results.

It would identify the enemy. That would clear the issue and provide a basis for forming policies to prosecute the war.

It would be a guide for domestic policies which, the New York Representative says, "must be consistent with the demands of the life and death struggle in which we are engaged."

Elsewhere in the free world, in all lands similarly menaced by the Communist conspiracy, an American declaration of war against the evil alliance would be a banner to which people could rally.

It would assert our rightful place of leadership in this conflict.

"Finally," Pillion says, "we shall have a justifiable hope that by accepting the challenge which the enemy poses to civilization itself, we can someday usher in an era of genuine peace, and the fulfillment of the highest aspirations of mankind."

There are some things a declaration of war on the Communist parties wouldn't do, and they are just as important as the positive gains.

It won't create a new war. Nothing Congress does, or fails to do, will change the fact that the Communist are already waging total war against us.

It won't involve us in any more peril. This war has been going on since 1917 when the Communists seized power in Russia.

It is a relentless war, an incessant war, a war of infinite duration. It is being waged totally, with orthodox and unorthodox methods, with conventional and unconventional weapons.

In urging support for his resolution, Pillion said:

"We must fully recognize that the Communist alliance will never be either persuaded or dissuaded from using their arsenal of thermonuclear weapons against us, if and when they believe they can do so with impunity. The passage of this joint resolution will however, signal the beginning—at long last—of our offensive against the Communists.

"It will be a war not of missiles and marching soldiers with bayonets. It will be largely a war of economic, political, diplomatic and psychological weapons. We will not, however, submit to the slavery of the Communist tyranny, whatever the cost may be. I do not offer this resolution as a panacea. This action does furnish the starting point for the defeat of our enemy."

That's something to think about. Will Congress act?

Desalinization of Water

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. FRANCIS CASE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 1, 1961

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article written by Roscoe Fleming, published in the Christian Science Monitor, entitled "Desalting Water: Long Way To Go."

This is a well-informed article on the problem of desalinization of water and indicates that although substantial progress has been made—enough progress has been made that water can be desalted and made practicable for use for domestic purposes—as yet we have a long way to go before we think in terms of irrigation. The research program should be encouraged, and I think the article will be of interest to many people.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DESALTING WATER: LONG WAY TO GO

(By Roscoe Fleming)

DENVER.—Representative WAYNE ASPINALL, Democrat, of Colorado, long-experienced chairman of the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, gently suggests that we well may have landed a man on the moon before we shall have learned how to freshen salt water so cheaply and in such immense quantities as to "make the deserts bloom."

Americans by nature expect the impossible immediately. Their minds—sometimes aided by rosy predictions of the Sunday supplement variety—leap ahead from the news of a scientific breakthrough, to its utmost useful development which they expect by day after tomorrow.

This has happened before. A decade ago we were hearing forecasts that limitless and well-nigh costless energy would be remaking the face of the world.

Atomic energy has, however, so far turned out to be relatively costly, strictly limited to use in specialized situations. One informed guess is that by 1975 it will still account for no more than 4 percent of the world's energy production, if that.

But it is proving of immense value in many situations to which it is suited; and

the long-range forecast is still good, that in time it will become mankind's chief source of energy.

In the same way, sea water and brackish water are now being converted to fresh in many specialized situations. But where fresh water can be made available in almost any way at all, sea-water conversion has got a long way to go before it can be made cheap enough to produce fresh water in such great quantities as to meet significant irrigation needs in an area such as the American West.

Desert redemption takes an awful lot of water. Nor is nature, as yet, giving something for nothing.

One major reason for public confusion and overoptimism as to the immediate potentialities of salt-water conversion is that the terms and quantities used are largely meaningless to most people.

Water at \$1 per thousand gallons, which is being produced at some of the experimental installations, sounds fine; and water at 50 cents a thousand gallons, which is the immediate goal, sounds wonderful. And as for the 30-cent cost which is as of now the ultimate goal, that sounds like utopia.

But making the deserts bloom, or producing any really major supply, means water by the trillions of gallons let alone billions. The latter is, even so, a meaningless figure. So let us adopt as a standard quantity figure the acre-foot, which is that generally used in western irrigation where the largest quantities of water are handled. An acre-foot is enough to cover 1 acre 1 foot deep; a quantity of 325,851 gallons. In rough calculation, 3 acre-feet constitute a million gallons.

To make a real desert blossom, like the rose, you'd need at least 4 acre-feet per acre yearly. In our semiarid West, an acre-foot is good for one-third to one-half an acre of crops yearly. But in the same environment, an acre-foot is a family supply for a year for domestic purposes, including lawn, garden, and maybe a modest swimming pool. A family will pay from \$60 to \$100 yearly for such a supply, while a farmer feels pinched and justly aggrieved if his irrigation supply costs more than \$5 an acre-foot. Mostly he gets it for less.

The present lower cost of fresh water made from salt water seems to be about \$1 per 1,000 gallons. This is the cost at the new Freeport, Tex., plant of the Department of Interior. (Because the Government is selling the water at 30 cents and 20 cents a thousand gallons, some impression has arisen that the latter figures encompass the cost.)

But \$1 per 1,000 gallons is \$326 an acre-foot. The estimated cost is the same for the brackish-water conversion plant now being built at Webster, S. Dak., and a pilot operation for the latter in Colorado is actually producing water for \$1.50 a thousand gallons, or just less than \$490 an acre-foot.

The immediate goal of 50 cents a thousand gallons figures out to \$163 an acre-foot; and the long-range goal of 30 cents still comes to just under \$100 an acre-foot.

The costs are bearable when the need is great enough, or when water freshened by nature is unavailable. The community of Coalinga, Calif., entirely underlain by brackish water, supplies its drinking water needs by one of the newer processes at \$1.43 a thousand gallons for 28,000 gallons daily, or about \$466 an acre-foot. But Coalinga had formerly to bring in its fresh water by tank car at a cost three or four times as great.

In like manner, many Great Plains families obtain drinking water for family and livestock by tank truck at \$3 to \$4 a thousand gallons; it costs one community on the order of \$1,900 an acre-foot.

In another euphoric aspect, we are sometimes told that communities near the seas, when able to supply their own needs by

freshening sea water, will thereupon surrender their claim to fresh water coming down the rivers so that communities high up on those rivers may benefit.

This is to argue that coast dwellers will gladly assume a rather steep rise in their water bills—for even an auxiliary supply of freshened water would mean such a rise—to benefit people farther inland. Further, there are apparently no quarrels and jealousies quite like those over water supply, as witness the long feuds between river basins.

Nature runs the most gigantic and still the cheapest sea-water conversion plant, the atmosphere, and drops its product upon the just and the unjust alike, though, it must be confessed, rather unequally. Every means of enhancing and saving this naturally fresh water—pollution control, evaporation and leakage control, cloud seeding, etc.—is still cheaper in terms of water saved or produced than any presently practicable means of freshening salt water.

To sum up, and as Representative ASPINALL was gently saying: Large-scale, low-cost sea-water conversion of such a nature as to make a really profound change and improvement in the world's water supply picture, even for the driest countries, is still a matter for the far future, for incessant work and improvisation, and for patience.

It is questionable whether to get people excited by implied promises of immediate large results will do this great and overall promising project any good.

Kansas Fourth Congressional District 1961 Opinion Poll Taken by Representative Garner E. Shriver

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. GARNER E. SHRIVER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 1, 1961

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, one of the closest links which a Representative has with his constituents back home is the daily mail. We all recognize that while many citizens do appraise their Congressman of their opinions—most people do not avail themselves of that opportunity.

Since early June of this year, I have been conducting an opinion poll in the Fourth Congressional District of Kansas. Through this questionnaire I attempted to present a representative random sample of my constituents with the opportunity to inform their Congressman of their views on varied issues which face the Nation and the Congress.

It has been most gratifying and enlightening to read the comments, and note the opinions of Kansans regarding such matters as Federal aid to education, medical care for the aged, fiscal policies, admission of Red China to the United Nations, agricultural policies, and the financing of the Federal highway program.

Many citizens also took the opportunity to comment regarding the most pressing problems which faced their respective local communities.

It is most reassuring to me to note the keen interest which citizens in my district demonstrate in public affairs. I

am sure that there is growing interest in Government all over this great Nation of ours.

My first public opinion poll was mailed to a random sample of 22,000 Kansans throughout my district. The mailing list was compiled by using the telephone directories of towns and cities of the Fourth District. I am pleased to report that more than 2,900 questionnaires already have been returned to me, and others are arriving daily.

FAVOR PAY-AS-WE-GO FISCAL POLICIES

One of the major conclusions which may be drawn from tabulations of the opinion poll is that most Kansans in my district favor a pay-as-we-go fiscal program.

Nearly 85 percent of the participants said they favor a balanced budget. Over 58 percent voted for an increase in postage rates to meet a \$900 million Post Office deficit.

Significantly, in the face of a growing Berlin crisis which will require greater defense spending, over 62 percent indicated they favor postponement of domestic programs now planned while over 50 percent approved of increasing taxes to meet greater defense expenditures.

FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION

Kansans are proud of the gains made by education at all levels as a result of continued local and State efforts. They recognize that much remains to be done to improve the quality of educational opportunities. However, those participating in the poll did not express en-

thusiasm for most of the Federal educational programs which have been proposed to the Congress.

Nearly 58 percent expressed opposition to Federal aid to education for school construction while over 73 percent were opposed to Federal assistance for teachers' salaries.

There was favorable sentiment expressed regarding a program of college loans and scholarships to students.

A SOLID "NO" TO RED CHINA BID

There was overwhelming opposition expressed toward the admission of Red China to the United Nations and many of the recent returns have expressed a similar attitude toward U.S. diplomatic recognition of Outer Mongolia.

VIEWS ON AGRICULTURE

Many of my constituents derive their livelihood from agriculture. It is interesting to note that over 80 percent of all participants expressed opposition to more Federal regulation of agriculture, only 10 percent favored more controls, and 10 percent were uncertain.

I appreciate the time and effort which many of the citizens in my district demonstrated in replying to my questionnaire. This has been a most valuable project in the conduct of my responsibilities, and I plan to continue to invite my constituents to inform me of their views on other issues through similar questionnaires.

Following are the percentage tabulations of the first opinion poll of the Kansas Fourth District:

Do you favor—	Percent		
	Yes	No	Uncertain
Federal aid to education for—			
School construction	37.3	57.9	4.8
Teachers' salaries	20.7	73.3	6.0
College loans and scholarships	46.8	43.7	9.5
Full local and State responsibility	73.6	20.9	5.5
Medical care to the aged financed through—			
Social security	30.5	64.5	5.0
Federal grants to States	38.5	49.9	11.6
No Federal program in this area	40.9	45.3	13.8
More Federal regulation of agriculture, higher price supports and production controls	10.2	80.2	9.6
Financing the Federal highway program through—			
Extension of 1-cent temporary gas tax	46.2	46.5	7.3
Combination of extended temporary gas tax and increased tax on trucks	53.4	37.3	9.3
Retaining present tax receipts on highway construction fund rather than diverting to general fund	82.7	5.4	11.9
Admission of Red China to the United Nations	10.0	76.4	13.6
Continuation of House Un-American Activities Committee	78.8	9.1	12.1
Increase in postage rates to meet a \$900,000,000 Post Office deficit	58.2	34.2	7.6
A balanced budget	84.8	4.2	11.0
If greater Federal expenditures in defense and foreign policy support are concluded to be in the national interest, should the necessary revenue—			
Be raised by increased taxes	50.8	38.2	10.9
Be financed through deficit spending	18.1	67.3	14.6
Come through postponement of domestic programs now planned	62.4	21.9	15.7

House Progress on Foreign Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN M. SLACK, JR.

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 1, 1961

Mr. SLACK. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the RECORD a letter by Representative JOHN S. MONAGAN, of Connecticut, which appeared in the July 25, 1961, edition of the New York Times. Mr. MONAGAN, a mem-

ber of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, quite properly took exception to editorial criticism in the Times that Congress has dawdled over the foreign aid bill. I subscribe to Mr. MONAGAN's statement that in the circumstances these criticisms were not justified:

HOUSE PROGRESS ON FOREIGN AID

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

The charge in your editorial of July 9, that "Congress is still dawdling, weeks behind schedule, over one of the most vital measures of our foreign and defense policies—the foreign aid bill" is most unfair.

It is true that a foreign aid bill was sent to the White House last year by May 12,

but you disregard entirely the fact that a totally new situation prevails this year.

The foreign aid bill which the House Foreign Affairs Committee is presently considering is the product of one of President Kennedy's task forces. This bill was not received by the House committee until May 29. Obviously, there would be no point in having hearings or committee deliberations until the new bill which the committee was to consider was produced.

Since the filing of this bill, the House committee has scheduled and heard major administration witnesses, as well as witnesses on the part of the public. Members of the committee have sat morning, afternoon, and evening, on many occasions, and we have also met during the July 4 recess in order to cope with this very difficult situation.

The House committee is now engaged in going over the bill, paragraph by paragraph, to determine the final product.

Congress may justifiably be subjected to criticism for many things, but in this instance, your critical comments were not justified.

JOHN S. MONAGAN,
Member of Congress.

WASHINGTON, July 15, 1961.

Crew of Nahant (Mass.) Coast Guard Station, Like Predecessors, Are Always Ready

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 25, 1961

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Lynn (Mass.) Evening Item of July 26, 1961, which discloses that the Nahant Coast Guard Station has for 61 years personified the motto of their service, "Semper Paratus" or "Always Ready":

[From the Lynn (Mass.) Evening Item, July 26, 1961]

CREW OF NAHANT COAST GUARD STATION, LIKE PREDECESSORS, ARE ALWAYS READY—ON DUTY 80 TO 100 HOURS A WEEK MANNING LAND AND SEA EQUIPMENT

(By Carl Jaffee)

Although the daily routine and rescue techniques at the Nahant Coast Guard Station have changed since it was first manned 61 years ago, today's crew, like their predecessors, personify the motto of their service, "Semper Paratus" or "Always Ready."

The original crew of the Nahant station lacked the equipment which is so essential today, but nevertheless proved invaluable in aiding the victims of accidents at sea.

The station first went into service following the wreck of the coal barge *Charles Briggs* at Sandy Cove Beach with the loss of all hands on board. Public agitation, spearheaded by the late Senator Henry Cabot Lodge, Sr., resulted in the construction of the Nahant station which has been serving the public ever since.

Until the outbreak of World War I, the station operated on an 8-month basis every year, remaining closed from March until August. Beginning in 1917, however, the station's crew manned their posts on a year-round basis.

One of the greatest changes in the daily routine at the Nahant station involves the

safety patrols. Modern radio equipment and other timesaving devices have reduced the number of actual patrols necessary to spot boats in distress. The old "east patrol," for instance, is gone, when a Coast Guardsman would walk along the shore to Bass Point with a lantern in one hand and a time clock in the other. He often faced 40- to 50-mile-per-hour winds in the 7-mile patrol, as he searched for ships in trouble. All that is left of the patrols, in fact, are "dusk patrols," launched 5 years ago, involving a search along the shore line from Lynn Harbor to Marblehead each Friday, Saturday, Sunday, and holiday evening.

Also gone from Nahant is the radio station which was in operation from 1926 to 1931. The Nahant station at that time served as a guide and relay service for commercial shipping as well as for Coast Guard craft. Despite the loss of the radio station, however, the Nahant post has remained a vital link in the Coast Guard system because of its search and rescue functions.

Men from the Nahant crew have been involved in a number of vital rescues throughout the years. The schooner *Lucia R. Porter* ran aground off Swampscott in May 1916, and the crew of five were saved from heavy surf under Coast Guard Captain Frank A. Gove. Three Nahant Coast Guardsmen went to Cairo, Ill., in 1927 to aid in rescuing flood victims as the Ohio River overflowed its banks. Another 27 people were rescued in 1957 when two boats collided off Nahant near Graves Light.

The speed and efficiency of the current Coast Guard equipment is one of the main reasons that minor accidents can be prevented from turning into near tragedy, according to Chief Boatswain's Mate Maurice G. Poulin of Nahant, the skipper of the station. A 16-foot rescue speedboat can be launched in less than 3 minutes. Other craft includes a 30-foot utility rescue boat; a 36-foot motorboat for heavy weather sea rescue, and the 10-ton amphibious duck which can travel at a speed of 45-50 miles per hour on land and from 6 to 8 knots at sea.

Just as important as the equipment is the alertness and the teamwork of the Coast Guardsmen who man the ships. An average of 10 men from the 15-man crew are on duty at all times. The 3-man crews which operate each of the boats remain constant so that each crew will develop maximum teamwork and efficiency. Each crew, moreover, consisting of a boatswain, an engine-man, and a seaman, can operate any of the boats at the station.

Even when there is no emergency, the men find plenty to keep themselves busy. The crew takes pride in maintaining the reputation of the station as one of the most spotless in the service, says Seaman Jerome O. Evald of Haddon Heights, N.J. Regular drills in swimming and lifesaving, communications, including semaphore and Morse code, position plotting, firearms, and seamanship also keep them active. Chief Poulin estimates that each man in his crew is on duty from 80 to 100 hours per week, including regular 4-hour stints in the watchtower which is occupied 24 hours a day.

Other crew members include: John E. Horner, of Danvers, boatswain's mate, first class; James E. Walsh, of Lynn, engineman, first class; Thomas P. Haywood, of Winthrop, engineman, second class; James B. Collins of Hull, boatswain's mate, third class; Edward F. Lombard, of Natick, engineman, third class; Eugene F. Flanagan of Winthrop, seaman; James C. Pickard, of Portland, Oreg., fireman; Leon T. Minta, of Jewett City, Conn., seaman apprentice; Louis R. DesForges, of Ware, seaman apprentice; James A. Murphy, of Gardner, fireman apprentice; William Hall, of Magnolia, commissaryman, third class; John E. Wilbur, of Beverly, seaman, and Michael Finn, of Springfield, seaman.

Operating under the U.S. Treasury Department, the Coast Guard would be under the command of the Navy in the event of war.

American Good Government Society Supports Electoral College Reform

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 1, 1961

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, a completely unprecedented interest in electoral college reform is sweeping America. Magazine articles, newspaper editorials, important speeches, committee reports, convention resolutions and radio-TV commentaries are appearing almost daily in some area of this great country or other in support of electoral college reform.

As one of the authors of Senate Joint Resolution 12, a slightly revised form of the old Mundt-Coudert amendment, I am highly gratified in this great upsurge of interest in this basic element of our presidential elections. I think reform of our presidential election machinery is the most significant single step needing to be taken in order to give equal rights to all Americans. Senate Joint Resolution 12 has eliminated the possibility of gerrymandering electoral college districts and would return this great Republic to the district plan for electing presidential electors which was followed during our first several presidential elections. It would correct the ensuing evils which have developed as the country adopted the general ticket, bloc-system, of electing presidential electors with its undemocratic and unfair winner-take-all formula for disenfranchising minority viewpoints. It would substitute no new evils of its own and it would accomplish this by a simple Constitutional amendment which maintains the respective vote impact of any State in the election of our Presidents.

I was highly gratified, therefore, by the news release issued by the American Good Government Society of 810 Dupont Circle Building, Washington, D.C., announcing the formation of a nationwide Committee on Electoral College Reform headed by Dr. John S. Millis, president of Western Reserve University of Cleveland, Ohio. I ask that the full text of this news release be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the news release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ELECTORAL COLLEGE EDUCATION PROGRAM

WASHINGTON, July 31.—A nationwide public education program on electoral college reform is being undertaken by a special committee of the American Good Government Society, former Representative Ed Gossett of Dallas, Tex., president of the society announced today.

This special committee on electoral college reform is headed by Dr. John S. Millis, president of Western Reserve University, Cleveland, Ohio. When completely organ-

ized it will have at least two members from each State.

"In recent years polls have shown repeatedly that the overwhelming majority of the people of the United States favor a change in the way the President and Vice President are elected," said Mr. Gossett. "However, they have also shown great lack of knowledge and misunderstanding of how the electoral college system operates. For example, a recent survey showed that 34 percent of those questioned thought the electoral college is a school for the children of Members of Congress.

"It is our hope that this educational program will bring about a clear understanding of the present system and how and why it should be changed. Former Presidents Hoover, Truman, and Eisenhower all favor a constructive change in the electoral system by constitutional amendment."

The first step in the educational program, Mr. Gossett said, will be the early publication and wide distribution of a brochure entitled "How Should the President Be Elected?" This brochure will explain just how the President is actually elected, the constitutional provisions which apply, and the historical background. It will describe the shortcomings of the present system and will explain the various plans for reform which are now pending in the U.S. Senate.

Members of the committee to date are: Stanford M. Adelstein, Rapid City, S. Dak.; Prof. Bower Aly, Eugene, Oreg.; Hon. James H. Pou Bailey, Raleigh, N.C.; Hon. Alvin M. Bentley, Owosso, Mich.; Richard Chapin, Lincoln, Nebr.; J. D. Stetson Coleman, Delray Beach, Fla.; Hon. Frederic R. Coudert, Jr., New York, N.Y.; Hon. Charles E. Daniel, Greenville, S.C.; Frank M. Dixon, Birmingham, Ala.; Robert B. Dresser, Providence, R.I.; Hon. Arthur Gardner, Washington, D.C.; Miss Louise Gore, Potomac, Md.; James H. Gray, Albany, Ga.; John Griffin, Sioux Falls, S. Dak.; Dr. Gunnar Gundersen, La Crosse, Wis.; Daniel C. Gainey, Owatonna, Minn.; Richard L. Herman, Omaha, Nebr.; Lewis R. Holding, Charlotte, N.C.; and Mrs. Edmund C. Lynch, Jr., New York, N.Y.

Also William G. McPadzean, Minneapolis, Minn.; Roger Milliken, Spartanburg, S.C.; Felix Morley, Gibson Island, Md.; William S. Morris III, Augusta, Ga.; Harold F. Ohlen-dorf, Osceola, Ark.; Leonard J. Pasek, Neenah, Wis.; Charles S. Payson, New York, N.Y.; Boswell Stevens, Macon, Miss.; Hon. Lewis L. Strauss, Brandy Station, Va.; Hon. Sinclair Weeks, Lancaster, N.H.; Lucius Wilmerding, Jr., Princeton, N.J.

National Charity Lottery of Panama

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 1, 1961

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, in this country, it is all too often true that gambling is a pillar of organized crime. I would like to bring to the attention of the Members of this House the example of Panama in order to show that gambling does not have to serve such evil ends. The national charity lottery of Panama functions, as its name would indicate, to provide funds for the support of hospitals, welfare institutions, and orphanages.

The national charity lottery plays quite an important role in the everyday life of Panama, and although that nation has a population of only 1 million, gross receipts from the national charity lottery were \$28 million in 1960. In that year, the profit to the Government was \$4.7 million.

In Panama, the gambling urge is centralized and channeled so as to achieve beneficial ends. Gambling dollars in Panama are not used to shore up racketeers as in the United States. Instead, they are used to promote the public welfare. When we realize the merits of a national lottery, we, too, will be able to siphon funds from the pockets of gangsters into the pockets of hard-pressed taxpayers.

National Music Workshop in Door County, Wis.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 1, 1961

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, during the week of August 6 to 12, a national music workshop will be held in Door County, Wis. The event will bring musicians from all over the Nation to live and learn together in the rustic, natural surroundings of Door County Peninsula.

Even though these are troubled times, we cannot, and must not, overlook the significance of also promoting cultural progress. Presented jointly by the University of Wisconsin and the Peninsula Music Festival, the events will include workshops on many aspects of music, including conducting, singing, and so forth; and which reflects a creative effort to develop talents and appreciation in this field.

I ask unanimous consent to have published in the Appendix of the RECORD an article which appeared in a recent edition of the Green Bay Gazette.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONWIDE MUSIC WORKSHOPS SET FOR DOOR COUNTY AUGUST 6 TO 12

MADISON.—During 2 weeks of annual music workshops, musicians from all over the Nation will live and learn together in the rustic natural surroundings of the Door County Peninsula.

The first of the workshops is the National Harp Master Class for advanced harpists from August 6-12. It will be conducted at the Clearing (at the tip of the Peninsula) by Marcel Grandjany, internationally celebrated concert harpist from the Juilliard School of Music in New York, assisted by Margaret Rupp Cooper, Madison, one of the leading harp instructors in the Midwest.

Grandjany, born in Paris, studied as a child with Juliette Georges Grandjany and Henriette Renie. Awarded the Premier Prix in harp at the Conservatoire National in Paris, at the age of 13, he later received the

Premier Prix in harmony. He made his concert debuts in Paris in 1909, in London in 1922, and in New York in 1924.

Grandjany's active concert career in recital and with orchestras throughout Europe, the United States, Canada, and Cuba has brought him wide acclaim as a composer and faculty member of music schools both here and abroad.

Thirty participants will be offered 7 full days of concerts and recitals, technique study, and close association with harp instructors and fellow students.

The University Clearing Singers Workshop from August 20-26 will be directed by Dr. Lara Hoggard from California. Dr. Hoggard did graduate work at Northwestern University and Union Theological Seminary and holds two advanced degrees from Columbia University.

CONDUCTORS' SYMPOSIUM SLATED ON AUGUST 20-25

Offered permanent positions at some of the country's top institutions, he prefers to be free lance so that he can work with various groups. He has established a brilliant reputation in church and school music education, teaching in workshops and festivals, as a composer and author, arranging and conducting for radio.

Enrollees in each session will be limited to 30 and will live in the Clearing dormitory. This area of lakes, rocks and forests offers an attractive setting for music study and appreciation.

Built by Jens Jensen (1860-1951) as a cultural garden to which he invited the world, the Clearing is operated by the Wisconsin Farm Bureau Federation.

Concurrent with the University Clearing Singers Workshop, the fourth annual Peninsula Symposium for Conductors is scheduled from August 20-25 at Fish Creek.

CONVENTION PLANNED

The University of Wisconsin Extension Music Department, in cooperation with Dr. Thor Johnson, and Prof. Richard C. Church, director of the University of Wisconsin Symphony Orchestra, offers this symposium in connection with the Peninsula Arts Association.

During the same week the National School Orchestra Association will hold its third annual convention in Fish Creek.

The objective of the symposium for conductors is the opportunity to study conducting techniques with Dr. Johnson and the provision of a professional symphony orchestra for demonstrations and actual conducting experience.

Participants will be enrolled in two categories—fellows and associates. Membership in each classification will be limited to 20.

Fellows, selected on the basis of background and experience, will be assigned orchestral works to prepare prior to the symposium. During the 6-day period they will rehearse and direct the Peninsula Festival Orchestra for symposium members and receive individual instruction from Dr. Johnson and the staff.

Associates will attend classes in conducting and baton technique, have individual conferences with Professor Church, and participate in all group activities during a week of intensive practical and theoretical study.

The late summer Door County music workshops are presented by the University of Wisconsin Extension Music Department under the direction of Prof. Emmett R. Sarig, the University of Wisconsin Music Department, and the Peninsula Music Festival. Requests for complete information should be sent to: University of Wisconsin Extension Music Department, 548 State Street, Madison, Wis.

Friendship Cannot Be Bought With Foreign Aid Money

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARROLL D. KEARNS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 1, 1961

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, it seems pertinent, with the current debate on foreign aid that is being waged in the Congress and elsewhere, to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an excerpt from a letter which a constituent of mine, John S. Schell, of Edinboro, Pa., sent to the President recently.

Mr. and Mrs. Schell served as foster parents this past year for an American field service exchange student from Indonesia. Their impressions of our foreign aid program, particularly in Indonesia, are based upon comments of this boy and other exchange students who visited their home during the past year.

Mr. Schell wrote President Kennedy: Indonesians, for example, regard us as "Uncle Sugar," who will be delighted to provide much more money than the \$660 million of our tax money to continue President Sukarno's ill-conceived and wasteful projects, as well as his personal indulgences. The main idea expressed by these students is that the United States will give them anything so the Communists won't—actually they're on both sides of the fence and our State Department blissfully and naively continue to recommend spending huge sums of money in foreign aid or "international giveaway" which we as a nation with many of our own domestic problems requiring money cannot afford * * * money has not bought friendship for us but rather contempt and we see in our student a deep desire to get all the material possession possible from the stupid Americans who have more than they need.

Money never bought friendship at home or abroad.

Included here as part of my remarks is the letter by Mr. Schell:

EDINBORO, PA., April 30, 1961.

PRESIDENT JOHN F. KENNEDY,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR PRESIDENT KENNEDY: I do trust that the secretary who reads this will forward the main thoughts expressed in the next section. My wife and I have served as foster parents this year for an A.F.S. exchange student from Indonesia and have come to know him rather well. In addition, several other exchange students have visited in our home and as a result, we have received a rather amazing picture of our country's impression upon young people in other nations.

Indonesians, for example, regard us as "Uncle Sugar" who will be delighted to provide much more money than the \$660 million of our tax money to continue President Sukarno's ill conceived and wasteful projects as well as his personal indulgences. The main idea expressed by these students is that the United States will give them anything so the Communists won't—actually they're on both sides of the fence and our State Department blissfully and naively continues to recommend spending huge sums of money in foreign aid or international giveaway, which we as a nation with many of our own domestic problems requiring money cannot afford. It angers us to hear our exchange students speak of Sukarno

doing this and that with our money while many Americans are out of work and hungry.

Thus, might we respectfully but urgently request your consideration of these suggestions:

1. Cease or greatly reduce foreign aid funds to Indonesia and other countries as well. Money has not bought friendship for us but rather contempt and we see in our student a deep desire to get all the material possessions possible from the stupid Americans who have more than they need. As a Nation, we are taking money from many citizens who can not afford the present high taxes and actually wasting it in the grandiose rathole of so-called foreign aid. Pipe dreams such as this, which lack clearheaded consideration, are pushing us closer to the status of a second rate nation and perhaps we deserve this if we are so stupid.

2. Review our State Department's snub of an old friend, the Netherlands, in refusing to send a delegate to the New Guinea Council Installation. It seems we are being swayed into some rather assinine actions in an attempt to win the "friendship" of Sukarno who to me appears both morally and intellectually bankrupt. Please do not be "taken in" by the oriental charm but lack of real character which seems so typical of Indonesians.

Please give these thoughts your serious consideration and do act with more intelligence than our Congress and administration has in foreign aid matters thus far. Best wishes to you from an active "member of the opposition" and may our country under your administration come closer to the sort of America we all want.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN S. SCHELL.

Dollar Instability

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. ROUSSELOT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 1, 1961

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, in the May 1961 issue of the Monthly Letter on Business and Economic Conditions, published by the First National City Bank of New York, there appeared a table showing the rates of depreciation during the last decade of the U.S. dollar—2.1 percent—and of the currencies of 42 other nations.

The alarming rate of depreciation experienced by the U.S. dollar manifests the urgent need for a balanced Federal budget and a strong gold reserve.

With the Kennedy administration recommending repeal of the gold reserve requirement applicable to Federal Reserve notes and proposing Federal assumption of welfare programs which will perforce involve deficit budgeting of a monumental scope, I think it important that Members of the Congress have an opportunity to peruse the table to which I refer. I insert, under unanimous consent, the table in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

DEPRECIATION OF MONEY

The following table presents our annual review of comparative rates of depreciation of money, in this instance covering 43 countries, 1950-60. The shrinkage of currencies is measured, inversely, by the rise in cost-of-

living or consumer price indexes as reported by the various governments. Year-to-year indexes of living costs for 18 countries are shown in the chart.

The U.S. dollar has been shrinking at an annual rate of 2.1 percent. Belgium, Germany, and Canada are among the industrial nations experiencing about this same rate of depreciation, one that means a loss of half the value of the currency in 33 years. Upward price pressures were measurably greater in 1950-55, but since then have been retarded, in Italy, the Netherlands, Japan, the United Kingdom, and Sweden.

In eight cases, the shrinkage in the value of money, exceeded 10 percent per year compounded, with results of shaving anywhere from two-thirds to 99 percent of the buying power of the currency unit over the decade.

	Indexes of value of money			Annual rates of depreciation (compounded)		
	1950	1955	1960	1950-55	1955-60	1950-60
Philippines.....	100	104	94	Pd. -0.8	Pd. 2.1	Pd. 0.7
Ceylon.....	100	96	93	Pd. .8	Pd. .6	Pd. .7
Portugal.....	100	101	92	Pd. -2	Pd. 1.9	Pd. .9
Guatemala.....	100	91	91	Pd. 1.8	Pd. 0	Pd. .9
Switzerland.....	100	92	87	Pd. 1.6	Pd. 1.1	Pd. 1.4
Ecuador.....	100	83	84	Pd. 3.7	Pd. -2	Pd. 1.8
Belgium.....	100	90	83	Pd. 2.1	Pd. 1.7	Pd. 1.9
Germany.....	100	91	82	Pd. 1.8	Pd. 2.2	Pd. 2.1
India.....	100	106	81	Pd. -1.1	Pd. 3.1	Pd. 2.1
Lebanon.....	100	103	81	Pd. -6	Pd. 4.7	Pd. 2.1
United States.....	100	90	81	Pd. 2.1	Pd. 2.1	Pd. 2.1
Canada.....	100	88	80	Pd. 2.5	Pd. 1.9	Pd. 2.2
El Salvador.....	100	78	77	Pd. 4.8	Pd. .2	Pd. 2.5
Pakistan.....	100	90	75	Pd. 2.0	Pd. 3.6	Pd. 2.8
Italy.....	100	82	75	Pd. 3.9	Pd. 1.8	Pd. 2.9
Netherlands.....	100	85	74	Pd. 3.2	Pd. 2.6	Pd. 2.9
Denmark.....	100	83	71	Pd. 3.7	Pd. 3.0	Pd. 3.3
South Africa.....	100	79	71	Pd. 4.6	Pd. 2.1	Pd. 3.4
Ireland.....	100	79	69	Pd. 4.7	Pd. 2.5	Pd. 3.6
Japan.....	100	74	67	Pd. 5.8	Pd. 2.0	Pd. 3.9
United Kingdom.....	100	76	67	Pd. 5.2	Pd. 2.6	Pd. 3.9
New Zealand.....	100	75	65	Pd. 5.6	Pd. 2.7	Pd. 4.2
Norway.....	100	74	64	Pd. 5.8	Pd. 2.8	Pd. 4.3
Sweden.....	100	76	64	Pd. 5.3	Pd. 3.5	Pd. 4.4
Spain.....	100	88	61	Pd. 2.6	Pd. 7.1	Pd. 4.9
Austria.....	100	67	60	Pd. 7.8	Pd. 2.1	Pd. 5.0
Finland.....	100	80	58	Pd. 4.3	Pd. 6.3	Pd. 5.3
France.....	100	76	57	Pd. 5.3	Pd. 5.5	Pd. 5.4
Greece.....	100	64	57	Pd. 8.6	Pd. 2.2	Pd. 5.4
Australia.....	100	66	57	Pd. 8.0	Pd. 3.0	Pd. 5.5
Colombia.....	100	81	52	Pd. 4.0	Pd. 8.6	Pd. 6.3
Iran.....	100	68	51	Pd. 7.4	Pd. 5.7	Pd. 6.6
Mexico.....	100	65	49	Pd. 8.3	Pd. 5.2	Pd. 6.8
Peru.....	100	71	47	Pd. 6.6	Pd. 7.8	Pd. 7.2
Turkey.....	100	78	41	Pd. 4.8	Pd. 12.2	Pd. 8.6
Israel.....	100	39	32	Pd. 16.7	Pd. 3.9	Pd. 10.8
China (Taiwan).....	100	45	28	Pd. 14.9	Pd. 8.8	Pd. 11.9
Uruguay.....	100	59	21	Pd. 10.0	Pd. 18.4	Pd. 14.3
Brazil.....	100	45	15	Pd. 14.6	Pd. 20.3	Pd. 17.5
Argentina.....	100	44	9	Pd. 15.3	Pd. 27.6	Pd. 21.7
Paraguay.....	100	14	8	Pd. 33.0	Pd. 11.1	Pd. 22.8
Chile.....	100	18	5	Pd. 29.1	Pd. 23.6	Pd. 26.4
Bolivia.....	100	7	1	Pd. 40.5	Pd. 34.6	Pd. 37.6

NOTE.—Depreciation computed from unrounded data and measured by reciprocals of official cost-of-living or consumer price indexes.

Some More Feed Grain Figures

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 1, 1961

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I desire to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD some additional figures in connection with feed grains:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D.C., July 21, 1961.

HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BECKWORTH: In our letter to you of June 1, 1961, we informed

you that we had written to the ASCS State offices for estimates of farmer participation in the 1958, 1959, and 1960 price-support programs for barley, corn, grain sorghums, oats, rye, soybeans, and wheat in any two, three, and four of these crops.

The enclosed tabulation shows the infor-

Number of farmers participating in price support loan programs for barley, corn, grain sorghums, oats, rye, soybeans, and wheat in 1958, 1959, and 1960.

mation received from the ASCS State offices in this connection.

We trust this information will be satisfactory for your use.

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES S. MURPHY,
Under Secretary.

State	Percent of farmers participating in any 2 of above crops			Percent of farmers participating in any 3 of above crops			Percent of farmers participating in any 4 of above crops		
	1958	1959	1960	1958	1959	1960	1958	1959	1960
Alabama.....	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Alaska.....	0	0.2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Arizona.....	2	7	4	0	1	2	0	0	0
Arkansas.....	9	8	6	10	9	7	11	10	8
California.....	5.8	3.9	2.7	5.5	3.8	3.9	4.8	3.2	2.3
Colorado.....	10	3	2	2	0	0	0	0	0
Delaware.....	10	5	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Florida.....	2	2	1	1	1	1	0	0	0
Georgia.....	4	10	7	0	0	0	0	0	0
Idaho.....	45	30	20	15	10	2	0	0	0
Illinois.....	13.8	4.8	2.4	1.5	0.9	0.6	0	0	0
Indiana.....	14	16	18	13	13	15	9	11	13
Iowa.....	77.9	22.6	12.0	7.7	1	1.2	7.1	1.1	1.1
Kansas.....	85	75	80	5	7	12	0.01	0.01	0.01
Kentucky.....	1.5	0	0	1.5	0	0	0	0	0
Louisiana.....	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Maine.....	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Maryland.....	25	25	25	0	0	0	0	0	0
Michigan.....	7	6	9	3	2	2	1	1	1
Minnesota.....	15	6	7	3	1	1	1	6.5	0.5
Mississippi.....	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0	0
Missouri.....	30	30	30	10	10	10	2	2	2
Montana.....	18	26	26	0	0	0	0	0	0
Nebraska.....	60	55	55	30	23	26	2	3	4
Nevada.....	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
New Jersey.....	-1	-1	-1	0	0	0	0	0	0
New Mexico.....	21	14	19	1	0	1	0	0	0
New York.....	8	9	8	3	2	2	0	0	0
North Carolina.....	50	60	40	20	25	15	1	1	0
North Dakota.....	52	40	39	55	41	40	56	41	40
Ohio.....	25	20	25	8	5	5	-1	-1	-1
Oklahoma.....	13	4	6	0.7	0.2	0.3	0	0	0
Oregon.....	27.9	8.8	40	2.4	0.1	0.3	0.05	0	0
Pennsylvania.....	20	20	20	5	5	5	0	0	0
South Carolina.....	14.4	13.1	11.6	3.0	1.3	1.7	0.3	0.7	0.3
South Dakota.....	35	3	32	17	1	14	4	0	3
Tennessee.....	3	6.5	6.5	0	0	0	0	0	0
Texas.....	12	5	10	0.50	0.25	0.25	0.25	0	0
Utah.....	-1	-1	-1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Virginia.....	5.3	1.1	0.9	1	0	2	0	0	0
Washington.....	31	28	24	14	12	5	-1	-1	-1
West Virginia.....	5	5	5	0	0	0	0	0	0
Wisconsin.....	5	5	5	0	0	0	0	0	0
Wyoming.....	6	3	6	1	1	1	0	0	0

¹ Very little price-support activity.

Delinquents: Who's To Blame?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 1, 1961

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the Evening Star of July 31, 1961, contained a column by Mr. William S. White which I feel merits the attention of every Member of the Senate, particularly those who favor appropriating vast sums of Federal aid money to solve our juvenile delinquency problems. I was impressed with this column, particularly the last paragraph which expresses exactly my sentiments on efforts to obtain Federal aid funds to solve our juvenile delinquency problems. I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

DELINQUENTS: WHO'S TO BLAME?—PARENTS SHOULD DISCIPLINE CHILDREN, NOT PASS BUCK ON RESPONSIBILITY

(By William S. White)

In the matter of juvenile delinquency and widespread juvenile shiftlessness there are increasing signs of a healthy revolt against that old American custom of expecting George to do it—George in this case being the Government.

Many days of solemn congressional hearings here into such things as violence on television and into ways and means to make the youngsters pull up their socks in general have produced about what might have been expected. There have been endless headlines and endless speeches in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and there has been much viewing with alarm.

At last, however, and partly due to certain unusually brave Government officials like Secretary Ribicoff of Health, Education, and Welfare, the plain facts are insisting upon raising their plain heads above all this hulabaloo. The plain facts are these:

There is not now, and there never will be so long as we retain constitutional free speech and the right to private management of private property, any lawful and effective means of preventing television from showing what the public either wants or is

too lazy or too stupid to reject by turning off the dial.

And there is not now, and never will be, any lawful and effective way to saddle the public authorities entirely with the responsibility which belongs to parents, and which always has and always will.

This is the simply responsibility to direct, to guide, and to discipline—repeat discipline—their children.

There is no reason whatever why Federal action should be taken, even if it could be taken, to prevent children from seeing sordid or otherwise harmful TV programs.

There is a perfectly simple remedy, a homegrown, do-it-yourself one which does not even require a kit from the hardware store.

It does not require a vast lobbying effort under the slogan "There ought to be a law." It does not require a marching host of boycotters.

It does not require sending delegations to the Federal Communications Commission, to Congress or the White House—or even to city hall. It only requires grownup people to do one little thing.

Tell the children to shut off the blasted TV at those times when programs obviously unsuitable for them are going on. And make sure that it really is shut off.

The same goes for movies, and, actually, for juvenile delinquency itself. In 9 cases out of 10 any father or mother who cannot cope with this thing before it starts is simply not doing his or her job.

Nobody needs a degree in "child care," for illustration, to know that teenagers should not be careening around in automobiles past midnight. And the way to stop it is just to stop it; physically, if nothing else will do.

Some will object that there are cases where a mother has to work and a father is away a great deal. The answer is not at all complicated: Any adult capable of bringing a child into the world can find the time, if he really wants to, to give that child some responsible guidance.

Now, of course, it is a sad fact of life that some children—a very few—are never amenable to any kind of discipline. In such cases the parent can only do his best. But it is extremely improbable, at all events, that any number of Federal regulations, on television, movies or anything else, would accomplish much here.

So the vast majority of American parents have only one necessity: To do their plain duty by the children and quit expecting somebody or everybody else—the Government, the schools, some committee or other, some social worker or other—to do it for them.

It is a frustrating, almost a sickening, thing to see a Nation which grew great long ago on personal guts and personal responsibility run howling to Congress for protection against its own children.

Ohio American Legion Endorses House Joint Resolution 447

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN R. PILLION

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 1, 1961

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to advise this Congress that the American Legion of Ohio approved and expressed its support for House Joint Resolution 447.

This resolution would recognize the total war being waged by the international Communist conspiracy, consisting of 98 national Communist Parties, against the United States and the free world.

Mr. Arthur E. Smith, fourth district Americanism chairman, Department of Ohio, wrote me on July 24, as follows:

The enclosure appeared in the Cincinnati Enquirer on July 23, in relation to our support of House Joint Resolution 447.

The Americanism Committee, Department of Ohio, felt genuinely impressed with the meaningful contents of the resolution.

Chicago Sun-Times Cites Proposal To Aid Education Through Libraries and Museums

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 1, 1961

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, in an editorial in the July 28 issue of the Chicago Sun-Times support is given to the proposition, set forth in H.R. 7478 and H.R. 7481, to allow further income tax deductions for contributions to museums and libraries. Quite accurately the editorial points out that this proposal has a close relationship to the improvement of the quality of American education. In considering the subject of education, we must consider library and museum facilities as well as colleges and universities, vocation education and rehabilitation as well as primary and secondary schools, research and new educational ideas as well as buildings and equipment. The focus of these bills is educational improvement, a further tax incentive for the advancement of quality education in America.

I should like to place this editorial from the Chicago Sun-Times in the Record under permission heretofore granted:

TO HELP MUSEUMS AND LIBRARIES

As most persons who itemize their income tax returns know, they may list as tax deductions certain contributions to worthy enterprises. Up until 1954, the limit was 20 percent of adjusted gross income. In that year, Congress, wishing to encourage greater contributions to churches, hospitals, and educational institutions, raised the percentage for them to 30 percent. For other categories it remained at 20 percent.

The Internal Revenue Service has interpreted Congress wording so as to exclude certain educational enterprises, such as the Art Institute of Chicago, from the benefits of the broadening bill. Certainly museums and libraries are educational institutions, particularly for the general public.

To clarify the congressional intent in specifying educational institutions as beneficiaries of higher tax exemption provisions, two bills have been introduced in Congress this year. One is by a Republican, THOMAS B. CURTIS, of Webster Groves, Mo., and the other by a Democrat, EUGENE J. KEOGH, of Brooklyn, N.Y. Both extend the 30-percent deduction to any "museum of history, art, or science or a library open to and operated for the benefit of the general public and

which normally receives a substantial part of its support from the United States, or any State or political subdivision, thereof, or from direct or indirect contributions of the general public."

The Curtis-Keogh bills recognize that libraries and museums are important to our educational system and deserve the same encouragement from Government that schools and colleges receive. We urge Congressmen to support them. Whatever small loss to the Treasury they cause will be made up many times more for all citizens by strengthening and improving libraries and museums that serve them directly.

Tributes to Dicky Bryant

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. SAM J. ERVIN, JR.

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 1, 1961

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, the July 14, 1961, edition of the Raleigh (N.C.) News and Observer carried a story concerning Dicky Bryant, a 12-year-old boy, who had taken a 5-mile hike. As the article pointed out, there is nothing very unusual about 12-year olds taking hikes of this sort, in an effort to qualify for advancement in the Boy Scouts; but in this particular case it was most unusual, for the young man involved lost his legs in a tragic accident less than 2 years ago.

To me, this story was inspirational. It reflects, I feel, the stalwart and courageous independent nature of our country's early settlers and Founding Fathers. This story deeply touched me and made me feel proud of this young man—and especially proud that he is a North Carolinian. By his exemplary act, this young man has given courage and inspiration to others. I am certain that many who have afflictions have taken new hope after learning of this young man's accomplishment; and, by the same token, those of us who have known no impairment feel inspired to achieve even more. I was extremely pleased to note that the Washington Evening Star, in an editorial of July 18, also paid tribute to Dicky Bryant's victory over adversity.

This editorial was most appropriate, I feel, as recognition of the stamina and moral fiber of America's wholesome youth, as epitomized by Dicky Bryant.

In an era when so much attention is given juvenile delinquency, it was heartening to me to read this story, and I should like to share it with my colleagues.

Therefore, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the article and the editorial printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the article and the editorial were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the News and Observer, Raleigh, N.C., July 14, 1961]

DICKY TAKES A HIKE WITH SCOUT PALS

CHARLOTTE.—Dicky Bryant, who wants to be a Boy Scout, second class, took a 5-mile hike with his pals Thursday.

Nothing unusual about that—lots of 12-year-old boys have done it.

But Dicky made it with two artificial legs. He lost his legs above the knees under the grinding wheels of a freight train over 19 months ago.

Slowly, surely he has been fighting his way back to normal routine. He returns to seventh grade at Thomasboro school in the fall. He's been using artificial limbs for about 17 months.

The hike over secondary roads took 4 hours. "I did all right, although I fell to my knees a couple of times," Dicky related proudly.

"We got a ride back. I guess I might have made it back without a ride if I'd had to, but I would have been real, real tired," he added.

The hike was part of the requirements toward becoming a second-class Scout. An oral test will determine whether he makes the grade.

Dicky lives with his waitress mother, Mrs. Pauline Bryant, three sisters and a brother. Two older sisters have married.

Dicky recalled a more trying ordeal in his scout training.

"I sure made a mess of things camping out some weeks ago. I tried to fry the eggs without any grease in the pan. They were terrible."

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, July 18, 1961]

DICKY'S EXAMPLE

Dicky Bryant, a 12-year-old North Carolinian, has just taken a 5-mile hike with some of his friends. He has done so because he wants to be a Boy Scout, second class. He certainly has qualified, and in a decidedly first-class manner. Of course, lots of youngsters his age have walked as far as he has, and farther, but the very special thing about his performance is that he has carried it out on artificial legs, only 19 months after having been run over by a freight train. The example he has set does more than serve merely as an inspiration to the handicapped; it serves also, or ought to, as a kind of reproach to those all-too-numerous teenagers who seem to have come to the conclusion that walking is for the birds and that the only way to move from here to there, even from one's home to the corner grocery store, is by automobile. Dicky Bryant knows better, and his contemporaries, who are fortunate enough to be blessed with nonartificial legs, would be well advised to follow his lead.

If We Want To Win We Have To Risk Losing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. E. ROSS ADAIR

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 1, 1961

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, in a recent advertisement, there appeared a statement which I think is so excellent that I would like to include it herewith:

IF WE WANT TO WIN WE HAVE TO RISK LOSING

The curse of this age is compromise—too often with evil. So we support neutralist nations with billions for fear they might go Communist. We don't dare even whisper a suggestion that they proclaim a stand with the decent nations of the world. If we demanded such a stand, our billions might pay off.

And we let Russia get ahead in the space race, because we were afraid of racketeers who held up production by strikes and featherbedding. We didn't have the courage to risk being tough.

We can't afford full speed ahead on missiles because powerful pressure groups drain away selfish billions of tax money—groups we should have courage enough to tell go hang.

Once we did have the courage—America was determined with the man-in-space, and had the courage to chance it openly. And courage won. Every war to save America was won because our leaders and the people pledged our "lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor"—everything to win. And then America won.

Nothing worth having is ever won by weakly pecking at it, by being afraid of it. We believe the American people will back our President and Government in risking everything to preserve freedom—the American brand of freedom, not some compromised, watered down foreign version of it. Even if such a stand meant the atom bomb, we earnestly believe all decent, all real Americans would say once more, "give me liberty, or give me death." Who with a shred of decency left in him wants to live under enemy-dictated "coexistence" which is a parlor word today for slavery tomorrow.

Sound Appointments to the New Haven

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABNER W. SIBAL

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 1, 1961

Mr. SIBAL. Mr. Speaker, with the appointment of three trustees under the Bankruptcy Act, the New Haven Railroad has entered a new and critical period. It is essential that it emerge from this period in health and equipped financially to meet the growing needs of an expanding area. Moreover, the problems of the New Haven, although grave, are not unique. They are symptomatic of many of the troubles besetting the entire transportation industry across the country. A new national transportation policy is required urgently. But, in order to design this, we must have a clear understanding of what our present policy is. As an initial step, I have introduced H.R. 8364, which would direct the Secretary of Commerce to survey and analyze all present Federal and State regulations governing transportation including a survey of the structure of all governmental programs of assistance programs.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I offer for the RECORD the news release accompanying the introduction of H.R. 8364 and an editorial from the Hartford Courant of July 28, relating to the New Haven Railroad and the need for a national transportation policy.

It is an excellent editorial and I commend it to the earnest attention of every Member:

[From the Hartford Courant, July 28, 1961]

SOUND APPOINTMENTS TO THE NEW HAVEN

It was right that Judge Robert P. Anderson should name three trustees to take over the New Haven Railroad in bankruptcy.

The job is a big one. But even more important is the judicial independence and integrity Judge Anderson displayed in making his appointments. He was informed that the White House itself, via the Attorney General, favored the appointment of former Gov. Dennis J. Roberts, of Rhode Island. And this pressure was backed by some political big guns from Rhode Island and Connecticut.

The origin of such support may be deduced from the fact that way back in 1956 Mr. Roberts was a backer of John F. Kennedy for Vice President. But Judge Anderson noted that Mr. Roberts' "great ability and skill" had been devoted exclusively to politics, and so turned to professionally qualified trustees instead. He is right. The last thing the troubled New Haven needs is political appointments at the top, which have a way of proliferating in further political appointments down the line.

The three men who were chosen are well qualified. One of them, Harry W. Dorigan, knows not only railroads but the New Haven itself. He was fired by the elder Dumaine during the early years of the railroad's second descent into bankruptcy. Not only did Mr. Dorigan have a long record in the financial side of the railroad's management, but he has bankruptcy experience as well. During the New Haven's previous receivership he was executive assistant to the road's president, Howard G. Palmer, who was one of the trustees at that time. The other present trustees are an authority on corporation law who also has previous connections with the New Haven, Richard J. Smith, and a fiscal expert and lawyer, William J. Kirk. There can hardly be any question about FCC endorsement of these men.

So begins the long road back. But even such prudent and informed management as the railroad may now look forward to, may not be enough to turn the tide. Judge Anderson said that if the measures now begun are not enough, if no way can be found to make income and cost meet, then "The New Haven Railroad will simply have to go out of business." Here one may disagree with the judge. New England, and indeed the country as a whole, simply cannot afford to let the New Haven go out of business.

This railroad may have been dogged by an unusually evil fortune in recent years. But it is only a forerunner of others. The chief trouble bedeviling all American railroads lies in the changes wrought by the automobile and the truck, plus an unplanned and uncoordinated national transportation pattern. What not only the New Haven but all railroads need most of all is a carefully thought out national transportation policy. Such a policy must treat railroads, trucks, and buses, passenger cars, airplanes, and waterways as integrated parts of a single system, no one of which will be discriminated against as the railways are now. To fashion such a policy is beyond the powers of the ablest judge, the most competent trustees. It must be done by the President and Congress of the United States. And the hour is late.

NEWS RELEASE OF HON. ABNER W. SIBAL, CONGRESSMAN FROM THE FOURTH DISTRICT OF CONNECTICUT

Congressman ABNER W. SIBAL today called for a new national transportation policy and introduced legislation directing the Secretary of Commerce to initiate the first steps.

The Sibal bill would order the Secretary to survey and analyze all Federal and State laws and regulations affecting the transportation industry, including the structure of grant and loan authorizations.

The Connecticut Congressman, a member of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, said the bill would provide the information "which is essential as

a basis for action to insure that each form of transportation can function efficiently." "This," he continued, "will affect not only the overall transportation problems of the country, which are very grave, but will have a particular impact on the solution of the commuter railroad problem."

SIBAL declared:

"The present governmental approach to transportation has grown up in patchwork fashion over a long period of years. As a result, we now lack a uniform and consistent policy and, because of built-in inconsistencies, conditions of unfair competition and many basic inefficiencies exist among the various forms of transportation. Not only because of the commuter problem, but also for the economic welfare of the country as well as for our defense requirements, it is essential that the Government reassess its policies and that it treat the Nation's transportation facilities as a sum of integrated parts. The separate parts must be related to each other in such a way that each can perform its particular function in the most efficient manner with maximum benefit to the public.

"In order to do this, we must have a clear and total picture of present regulations and existing programs of governmental grants and loans. This picture would be provided under terms of my bill."

The Sibal measure would direct the Commerce Secretary to submit the results of his survey and analysis by June 30, 1963.

John Carroll University, Cleveland, Ohio

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK J. LAUSCHE

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 1, 1961

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, this year John Carroll University, University Heights, Cleveland, Ohio, is observing its 75th anniversary, and many significant programs have been planned during the year in observance of this anniversary, one of the most significant being a graduate workshop on Soviet ideology which was conducted on the campus June 20-24. Mr. Roger Tubby, Assistant Secretary of State, writing of this program, said:

The success of American leadership in championing the cause of international peace and freedom against the Soviet challenge lies in large measure in an accurate understanding by our citizens of the true nature of Soviet aims, techniques and motivations. John Carroll University is to be congratulated on offering the people of its community an opportunity to inform themselves on this subject under the guidance of specialists.

The Ohio House of Representatives recently adopted a resolution of congratulations to the university on the occasion of this 75th anniversary, and I ask unanimous consent that this resolution, together with a brief background history of John Carroll University, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution and history were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the members of the 104th General Assembly of Ohio, several of whom are alumni of John Carroll, take great pleasure

in honoring the 75th anniversary of the founding of John Carroll University in Cleveland, Ohio; and

Whereas founded in 1886 as St. Ignatius College, the name was changed to John Carroll University in 1923 in honor of John Carroll, America's first archbishop; and

Whereas operated as a private school by the Society of Jesus, John Carroll University has earned inestimable respect and esteem for its devotion to the task of providing the opportunity for enjoyment of its fine educational facilities and programs by young people of all faiths; and

Whereas John Carroll has gained national prominence not only for its excellent achievement in the field of education, but also for its acquisition of the finest Chesterton library and one of the leading seismological observatories in the country, among others, and

Whereas the brilliance and dedication of the faculty of John Carroll is evidenced by the many distinguished alumni who have attained noteworthy success in their various endeavors, and by the outstanding ROTC program which makes John Carroll one of the major sources of officers for the U.S. Army Transportation Corps: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the members of the House of Representatives of the 104th General Assembly of Ohio extend their sincerest congratulations to John Carroll University on the memorable occasion of its 75th anniversary and commend the faculty and administration for their superlative accomplishments and foresight in their educational programs; and be it further

Resolved, That the clerk of the house of representatives transmit duly authenticated copies of this resolution to Father Hugh Dunn, S.J., president of John Carroll University, William D. Fissinger, vice president for development, and the Carroll News.

JOHN CARROLL UNIVERSITY: ITS BACKGROUND

Since 1886, John Carroll University has served Greater Cleveland and the Nation by training young men and women of all faiths.

Now northern Ohio's largest liberal-arts college, it is operated by the Society of Jesus (the Jesuits). Its alumni list is notable, and as a private school it serves the public.

Founded under the name of St. Ignatius College in 1886, it was incorporated under Ohio law and empowered to confer all academic and professional degrees. The name Cleveland University was adopted early in 1923 but later that same year was changed to John Carroll University in honor of Archbishop John Carroll.

In September, 1935, the university was moved from its original site on the west side of Cleveland to its present campus on the eastern fringe of metropolitan Cleveland.

The 60-acre campus of John Carroll University is located in University Heights. The main approach is from the intersection of Fairmount Boulevard and Warrensville Center Road, but Grasselli Tower of the Administration Building is an identifying landmark visible from any direction.

Fourteen buildings, predominantly Gothic in architecture, make up the present physical plant of John Carroll University. Three student dormitories—Bernet Hall, Pacelli Hall and Dolan Hall—accommodate a total of 620 full-time campus residents.

Roadman Hall serves as the Jesuit faculty's residence and also houses the seismological observatory and several academic offices.

The administration building is occupied by administrative offices and by classrooms and laboratories. The library contains over 100,000 volumes for general use by students and faculty. Here also is the Robert Bayer collection of G. K. Chesterton first editions and manuscripts. This collection gives John Carroll University what many authorities consider the finest Chesterton Library in the world.

Other buildings include the headquarters of the school of business, the department of education, and the military science building. Two recently opened structures—the gymnasium (1957) and the student activities center (1959)—comprise the nerve center of extra-curricular campus activity. The library, (1961) is the newest building on the campus.

The university educates 2,000 young men in the college of arts and sciences and in the school of business. Sixteen hundred men and women are enrolled in the evening college. The graduate school has 400 students, the majority of whom are elementary and high-school teachers taking advanced professional training.

John Carroll has the largest ROTC transportation corps in the United States. Over 1,200 cadets are enrolled in this training program. John Carroll graduates comprise one-third of the second-lieutenants entering the U.S. Army Transportation Corps.

Alumni in ever increasing numbers are adding to the stature of Cleveland in its myriad of business, professional, and industrial activities. For example, over 400 Cleveland doctors received their premedical training at John Carroll. Similarly, 200 area dentists claim John Carroll as their undergraduate school, as do 450 lawyers, of whom 11 have distinguished themselves as court judges.

Degree programs are offered in 40 major fields of the arts, natural sciences, social sciences, and business. They include specific curriculums for preprofessional study leading to medicine, law, dentistry, engineering, teaching, etc. The full range of studies is available in day, evening, and summer sessions.

The Carroll Seismological Observatory was the fourth of its kind when founded in 1904. Today it ranks as one of the top completely equipped seismological stations in the country.

JOHN CARROLL UNIVERSITY: ITS FACULTY

As a Jesuit university, John Carroll University draws upon the intellectual resources and education experience of the Society of Jesus, which has operated colleges and universities for more than four centuries.

Fifty Jesuits are assigned to John Carroll. Their work as teachers and administrators culminates 15 years of individual Jesuit training, supplemented in many cases by further preparation in specialized fields at the major universities of the world.

At least 125 full-time lay teachers, well-trained specialists, work with the Jesuits in the classrooms and laboratories of John Carroll.

More than 60 percent of the full-time faculty have earned their doctorates. Lay faculty members are on 12-month contract. They enjoy a full range of fringe benefits. Lay faculty salaries are above average for the entire north central region.

The faculty of the university serves in four major academic units:

1. The college of arts and sciences.
2. The evening college.
3. The school of business.
4. The graduate school.

JOHN CARROLL UNIVERSITY: NAMED AFTER A GREAT RELIGIOUS LEADER

Founder, John Carroll, born on January 25, 1735, as the fourth of the seven children of Daniel and Eleanor Carroll of Upper Marlboro, Md., had grown up and been educated in those early years when it was unlawful, even treasonable, for Catholic children to attend a Catholic college even on the Continent of Europe 3,000 miles away. After schooling at home under the excellent training of his mother, whose own school days had been spent in France, young John spent a brief time at Bohemia Manor Academy in 1747-48 and then left, with his cousin Charles, for the long voyage across the Atlantic to the College of St. Omer, founded on

French soil by the English Jesuits and best loved by the boys of Maryland.

John Carroll entered the Jesuit Order in Europe. Because of the temporary suppression of the Jesuits, he returned to the United States in 1774 as a priest.

His cousin, Charles Carroll of Carrollton, the signer of the Declaration of Independence, was recognized as one of the foremost leaders of the Revolutionary period.

On June 9, 1784, Father John Carroll was appointed "head of the missions in the provinces of the new Republic of the United States of North America," and the jurisdiction of a Vicar-Apostolic in London over the Catholics in the former colonies was ended by this appointment of Father John Carroll as Prefect-Apostolic in the United States. In 1790 he was consecrated Bishop of Baltimore, and in 1811 he became America's first archbishop. Because of his episcopal position he did not rejoin the Jesuit Order when it was restored.

Full of years and grace, he died on Sunday, December 3, 1815, at the age of 81.

JOHN CARROLL: TOMORROW

The university is an arena in which the students meet their teachers in appropriate and adequate physical surroundings. It is the task of university administration to provide maximum facilities for both the student and the teacher. This idea, this administrative goal, is what is meant by university development.

Contributions by business, industry, and individuals have been invested in the enrichment of educational offerings and enlargement of educational facilities. Faculty salaries have been increased in order to attract and retain well-qualified lay teachers. Research has been sponsored to further the professional development of teachers.

John Carroll will become an even greater university through the further enrichment and enlargement of its educational work.

The university needs \$10 million as an addition to its endowed support. Income from such funds is used to provide merit salary increases for the faculty, opportunities for research, funded scholarships for intellectually gifted but needy students and endowed professorships for outstanding teachers.

If the university is to accept more students, the arena of learning must be enlarged to accommodate them. Buildings and essential facilities are necessary for further growth. In the face of national predictions of increasing college enrollments, John Carroll University is prepared to carry its share of the load as capital resources become available.

John Carroll's library is another forward step in its program to serve the community. On the drawing board is a new dormitory, and then a science building—steps in the fulfillment of John Carroll University's major product—the educated man.

Berlin and the Captive Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 1, 1961

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, the peoples of Eastern Europe and all those concerned about the plight of the captive nations in central and eastern Europe are most eager that the foreign policy of the United States does not reflect a condonement of Soviet imperialism in that area.

Several statements in President Kennedy's address to the Nation on July 25 have aroused a fear that the principle and goal of self-determination for these nations will be abandoned. Critics refer to the particular paragraph which reads:

We recognize the Soviet Union's historical concerns about their security in central and eastern Europe, after a series of ravaging invasions—and we believe arrangements can be worked out which will help to meet those concerns, and make it possible for both security and freedom to exist in this troubled area.

These statements are the foundation for the following telegram, dated July 26, 1961, to the President from the Assembly of Captive European Nations.

Under permission heretofore granted, I include the telegram:

TEXT OF TELEGRAM SENT BY THE ASSEMBLY OF CAPTIVE EUROPEAN NATIONS TO PRESIDENT JOHN F. KENNEDY ON JULY 26, 1961.

One-hundred million freedom-seeking people in Eastern Europe who, through no fault of their own, were overrun at the end of World War II by Soviet troops and absorbed into slave empire, will be shocked, Mr. President, by one statement in your important address last night. They will note with profound misgivings that no word was uttered to affirm their right to self-determination which is as indisputable as is that of peoples in other parts of the world and pour cause, that of the German people. Instead they were told that the Soviet Union, the most rapacious imperialist power of our times, is entitled to security in central and eastern Europe. The revival of the wartime myth that Soviet Russia was entitled to special rights at the expense of other nations to safeguard her security because she had been repeatedly invaded, is all the more regrettable as it is at complete variance with historical truth. Both Czarist Russia and Soviet Russia have an unmatched three-century long record of aggression against and conquest of their smaller neighbors. Some of the countries represented by our Assembly have been 10 times the victims of such Russian or Soviet invasions. This being the truth, to place security considerations of the Soviet Union before the right of self-determination of its victims is tantamount to recognizing rights of imperial conquest to big nations at the expense of smaller nations. It is tantamount to protecting the wolf against the lamb. Against such concept we must voice before the conscience of the world the protest of the enslaved nations of Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, and Rumania. It is up to the Western Powers to honor or forget their obligations under the wartime and postwar agreements pledging them to help our nations in the recovery of their independence and in the establishment of freely elected governments. But, we respectfully submit, there can be no doubt that neither the United States nor any other nation has the right to bargain away the inalienable rights of our nations in return for gains, real or illusory, in Berlin or elsewhere. We are sure that the people of our homelands would appreciate assurances to the effect that their rights are not negotiable.

Assembly of Captive European Nations:
Vaclavas Sidzkauskas (Lithuania)
Chairman, Stefan Korkonski (Poland)
Vice Chairman, Vasil Germenji (Albania), Dimitar K. Petkoff (Bulgaria),
Petr Zenkl (Czechoslovakia), Ilmar Raamot (Estonia), Ferenc Nagy (Hungary), Vilis Masens (Latvia), Constantin Visolani (Rumania), Brutus Coste, Secretary General.

Wisconsin: Ideal Location for New, Expanding Industries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 1, 1961

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the economic health of the Nation, both in terms of jobs and output of goods and services, depends to a large degree upon the development of new, and expansion of existing, businesses and industries.

We recognize, of course, that selection of the right location for such operations contributes to its prospects for success.

Today, I would like to review some of the advantageous factors which make my home State of Wisconsin an extremely desirable and profitable place to operate business and industry. They include a good, ample labor force; a fine road, water, rail, air transportation network—particularly the completion of the St. Lawrence Seaway, which offers greater opportunities for waterborne traffic; the availability of public services; a good climate—not only for business, but also for employees; and many other factors which make a location site in Wisconsin a real land of opportunity.

Recently, the La Crosse Tribune published a thought-provoking editorial entitled "How a Big Industry Chooses a Plant Location—Many Factors Are Involved." It reflects also the advantages of the fine community of La Crosse—exemplary of new opportunity for business and industrial expansion in Wisconsin—and I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOW A BIG INDUSTRY CHOOSES A PLANT LOCATION—MANY FACTORS ARE INVOLVED

The Associated Press last week produced an editorial piece attempting to answer the questions of how a big industry chooses a plant site.

It is a revealing study of interest to La Crosse and similar communities which have the latching out these days, hoping to attract industry. We quote the AP:

"Industry looks for a new factory home with much of the care of a woman choosing a home.

"She wants good schools, churches, and neighbors; in general, a pleasant and secure environment in a well-run community. So does an industry and, like the housewife, it will pay a premium to get what it wants.

"Increasingly, plant location scouts for blue chip industries—and many others—are on the lookout for judiciously stocked libraries and attractive parks. They look askance at high juvenile delinquency rates, municipal corruption, voter disinterest, and vice districts.

"Of course, this isn't the whole story by a long shot.

"The paper companies must set up new mills in timbered areas, rather than on treeless plains, and distilleries will seek out bountiful water, not a desert site.

"Nearly all business decisionmakers, regardless of kaleidoscopic plant picking yardsticks, are after what some call a good

'business climate,' a term as hard to define as love.

"They don't like heavy taxes, but will swallow them if careful inquiry shows value received in topnotch municipal services.

"In the last 3 or 4 years, these subtleties have been giving real concern to discerning companies," said William A. Barrett, a plant location expert with Ebasco Services, Inc., counselor to enterprises across the country.

"Nine or ten years ago many companies were greatly swayed by low local taxes. But they learned that 5 years or so after they moved in they might get clipped and clipped badly."

"General Electric Co., General Motors Corp., and Procter & Gamble are three industrial giants that assign a big value to intangibles in a community surveyed as a plant site.

"We're interested in becoming an industrial neighbor," said a General Electric spokesman. He displayed an outline that detailed about 350 check points on factors ranging from toll bridges to an area's tornado history.

"With occasional exceptions, the large companies operate anonymously lest they raise false hopes. The analysts usually contact the political, civic, education, business, financial, real estate and employment agency leaders, along with railroad and utility men, to gather most of their data.

"They don't stop there.

"Aside from the basic facts, you can find out a lot of what you need to know about a place from a taxi driver or bell hop on the one hand and a leading minister or priest on the other," one analyst said.

"As to schools, they observe quality and adequacy of building and construction staff, pupil-teacher ratios, program content, school board makeup, and numerous other points.

"The first principle is still the need to operate at a profit. 'Each corporation or type of industry is a study in itself,' said Charles Ludlum, a plant location specialist of Austin Co.

"For example, a need for exceptionally pure water may affect a chemical company but not a foundry. Also very important in many cases is availability of skilled personnel. If you need them, you have to go where they can be found."

"Closeness to markets and the availability of raw materials, water, and other utilities also are important. Wage levels, labor-management history, construction costs, and expansion room are other considerations.

"An estimated 12,000 full and part-time agencies work at factory luring these days, counting State, regional, and local public bodies, railroads, utility companies, chambers of commerce, and banks.

"Some States spend \$500,000 a year in tax money promoting and advertising."

Cooperatives and the Private Grain Trade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 1, 1961

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, the Department of Agriculture has proposed that soybean cooperatives be eligible for crop support loans. A decision on this proposal is expected soon for the 1961 crop.

In this connection I would include pertinent portions of a letter I received

from an official of the Omaha Grain Exchange. The letter follows:

The future of the proprietary grain trade appears to be in the balance right at this time, with the emphasis by certain members of President Kennedy's Cabinet doing their utmost to stifle the taxpaying section of the grain trade and to give advantage to the cooperative element of the grain business.

In this, a copy of letter of Farm Grain Dealers of Iowa is being mailed, and I particularly call to your attention the underlined section of the wire from Roy Hendrickson which reads: "This is a major future policy to all grain co-ops not only in soybeans."

This is exactly what the private grain trade has feared was to be the plan of the cooperatives; but never before have we seen it in print.

The Beeghly portion of the letter is along the same line * * *; it appears now that the battlelines are definitely established between the cooperative grain trade and proprietary grain trade.

Out this way, we still feel America is best run by independent action of men with pioneering spirit, and we hope to keep it that way.

The letter of the Farmers Grain Dealers Association of Iowa—cooperative—mentioned above is, as follows:

FARMERS GRAIN DEALERS
ASSOCIATION OF IOWA,

Des Moines, Iowa, July 24, 1961.

To Presidents, Secretaries, and Managers of
Member Cooperatives:

Producers can measure the importance of the issue and challenge to farmers and to their cooperatives by the urgency and the action Roy Hendrickson stresses in his wire received in FGDA's office late Friday, July 21:

"This wire is being sent to all directors of the National Federation of Grain Cooperatives. Need your help badly in behalf of Arkansas Grain Cooperative. CCC Board June 14 acted to recognize coop soybean pool as eligible producers for support price purposes. This is a major future policy to all grain coops not only in soybeans. Its action has received vigorous protest from anti-coop forces including some who long posed as coop friends. Responding to complaint that CCC did not consult or listen to opposition, USDA today agreed to consider any views filed with it up to Friday, July 28. Consider it essential to register with Secretary Freeman support of soybean pool action and this is to request your vigorous participation in telegram and letter campaign to put starch in USDA backbone."

"ROY E. HENDRICKSON,
Executive Secretary, National Federation
Grain Cooperatives, Washington, D.C."

FGDA's justification of its support of the USDA decision to offer farmers the opportunity to improve and stabilize soybean prices through voluntary cooperatively organized and managed bean marketing pools had already been expressed in a telegram FGDA President Milford Beeghly addressed to all Iowa Congressmen on Thursday, July 20:

"After the most careful consideration, as president of the Farmers Grain Dealers Association of Iowa (cooperative), I am convinced that a USDA regulation authorizing soybean producers to pool their interests and thus make more effective use of the free market and the soybean price support program, should be published and made effective immediately so that it will be available to the producers of the 1961 crop which will be the largest of record.

"I understand the soybean regulation is patterned after the regulation governing the very successful rice pool. It is my studied opinion that the pool principle involved will contribute to the bargaining power and eco-

nomie welfare of farmers, promote orderly marketing and thus sustain and better utilize our free marketing system, stabilize prices, enhance the price support program and broaden its effectiveness, reduce administrative costs and burdens now borne by Government, and eventually assure processors a dependable, consistent, accessible supply of beans for processing at satisfactory stable margins and thus stabilize prices for soybean meal.

"I urge that you support USDA's position that this regulation will result in benefits to farmers, consumers, and all segments of the soybean industry. I deem its immediate publication essential to the development within agriculture of the countervailing economic and bargaining power essential to survival in today's economy. I would appreciate your conveying to Under Secretary Charles Murphy my support and I would hope your support, of this position."

"MILFORD M. BEEGLY,
President, Farmers Grain Dealers Association of Iowa."

This is a vital issue—its long range significance can't be overemphasized.

The anti-co-op forces are going all out in their effort to force USDA to abandon its announced position. Do you need any better evidence that the pool idea will help farmers and their cooperatives? Apathy at this moment could foreclose an opportunity not likely to recur. Can you afford to put forth any less effort than your anti-co-op opposition?

Address your telegram or night letter supporting the soybean pool principle to: Hon. Orville L. Freeman, Secretary of Agriculture, Washington, D.C.

If the cost of telegrams and night letters is of any concern—FGDA considers this to be a matter of such fundamental importance that it will gladly reimburse any co-op member who wires Secretary Freeman if the member or his co-op will furnish FGDA with copies of the wires sent, together with a request for reimbursement.

Telegrams in your own words would be much preferred, but in case you are too busy you might prefer to use one of these three sample wires:

SAMPLE MESSAGE NO. 1

HON. ORVILLE L. FREEMAN,
Secretary of Agriculture,
Washington, D.C.:

We urge no letdown in June 14 action by CCC Board recognizing co-op soybean pool. This is very important to producers and has been properly interpreted as a most helpful step for farmers. Please disregard selfish interest of opposition to your constructive action.

(Signature)

SAMPLE MESSAGE NO. 2

HON. ORVILLE L. FREEMAN,
Secretary of Agriculture,
Washington, D.C.:

As a farmer I hope you will stand pat on your helpful action of June 14 recognizing co-op pool program. We need stronger farm cooperatives, and this is no time for retreat.

(Signature)

SAMPLE MESSAGE NO. 3

HON. ORVILLE L. FREEMAN,
Secretary of Agriculture,
Washington, D.C.:

I consider your action in recognizing co-op pool plan in soybean support program a wise and helpful action. I trust that the long record of opposition to farm co-ops of some private dealers and processors will not unnerve you. You are to be commended for your spirit of helpfulness to farmers and their cooperatives. I feel this is important

enough to justify your personal intervention.

(Signature)

The question arises, Mr. Speaker, Is free enterprise to be eliminated from the Nation's grain business? Would this not be the intent of certain groups as indicated above?

Co-ops serve a useful purpose, but many people feel there should be a place in our economy for both cooperatives and free enterprise. If the co-ops are bent upon destruction of the private grain trade, then it may be time for the Congress to give a close and careful look at their entire operations and at tax legislation as it applies to them.

**Lt. Gen. William Hall Receives ROA
Hall of Fame Award**

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF**

HON. CARL ALBERT

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 1, 1961

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, each year the Reserve Officers Association names a recipient of the Minute Man Hall of Fame award. The honor goes to a person who has contributed not only to ROA, but to his Nation, as well. This year, Lt. Gen. William E. Hall, commander of the National Continental Air Command, received the award.

Bill Hall was born in McAlester, Okla., my hometown. We were boys together. We were in McAlester High School at the same time. I have watched this man grow as a leader and an officer dedicated to the service of his country. He has moved upward steadily, assuming positions of greater responsibility in his Air Force duties.

Under unanimous consent, I wish to insert in the Record the following article from the July 1961 issue of the Officer, paying tribute to my good friend and a great American, Bill Hall:

**LT. GEN. WILLIAM HALL RECEIVES ROA HALL
OF FAME AWARD**

When the ROA awards board met to name a person to be honored with the association's Minute Man Hall of Fame award for 1961, it wasn't a difficult job. Bill Hall, or to be more formal, Lt. Gen. William E. Hall, not only has been a friend of ROA for a long time but he has contributed outstandingly to his country for many years.

So the choice of the commander of the nationwide Continental Air Command to receive the top honor at ROA's 1961 convention in San Antonio was an easy one.

Past recipients have included Congressman MENDEL RIVERS of South Carolina, a ranking member of the House Armed Services Committee and an expert on military affairs, and Gen. Herbert B. Powell, commander, Continental Army Command.

Bill Hall is one of those grand people who wears his rank well; he measures fully to his responsibilities, and is in every sense of the word a commander.

The Continental Air Command with headquarters now at Robins Air Force Base, Ga., is no small outfit. It commands the Air Force Reserve's 15 troop carrier wings, has

jurisdiction over headquarters of the 52-wing Civil Air Patrol, and trains a large number of Reserve units prepared to provide recovery and support at U.S. Air Force bases and civilian airports throughout the country in event of attack.

More than 75,000 reservists are in a ready status and an additional 500,000 could be called to active duty in the case of a national emergency or war.

General Hall has commanded CONAC since July 1, 1957. Earlier, he had served as Assistant Chief of Staff for Reserve Forces in Washington.

A command pilot, he has more than 27 years of flying experience.

Bill Hall's country calls upon him for more than one job: In addition to commanding CONAC, he serves as Air Force representative of the U.S. delegation to the Military Staff Committee of the United Nations.

Born at McAlester, Okla., October 22, 1907, General Hall is a West Point graduate—class of 1929. He is an enthusiastic sportsman; at West Point he captained the track team in his first class year and received All American honorable mention as a football center.

Following 4 years' service with the field artillery, the general entered primary flying school at Randolph Air Force Base, Tex., in 1933 and graduated from the advanced flying school at Kelly AFB in that State a year later.

During his early Air Force career, General Hall filled a number of routine assignments—serving successively with the 78th Pursuit Squadron at Albrook Field in the Panama Canal Zone and, in 1937, as operations officer with the 14th Airbase Squadron at Bolling Air Force Base, Washington, D.C.

General Hall attended the Air Force Tactical School at Maxwell AFB, Ala., in the fall of 1939. Upon graduation he returned to Bolling AFB as post adjutant. He became assistant executive officer there in July 1941.

In September 1941, the general was transferred to Air Force Headquarters as assistant to the air inspector. He became Secretary of the Air Staff there a year later, and Deputy Chief of Air Staff in March 1943.

During the crucial period of World War II, General Hall was assigned to the 15th Air Force in the Mediterranean theater as Chief of the American mission to Bulgaria. Later he was appointed deputy commander of the 15th Air Force in Italy.

Following V-E Day, the general returned to the States as Deputy Assistant Chief of Air Staff for Personnel. He was appointed air member of General Eisenhower's Advisory Group in 1946.

The following year General Hall was assigned to Turkey as Chief of the U.S. air survey mission—which conducted a modernization study of the Turkish Air Force. His next assignment was to Berlin—as director of intelligence for the commander in chief of the European Command during the Berlin airlift.

Reassigned to Air Force Headquarters in November 1949, General Hall was named Deputy Director of Legislation and Liaison in the Office of the Secretary of the Air Force. He became Director the following May.

The general assumed command of the 4th Air Force at Hamilton AFB, Calif., in January 1951. During early fall of 1952, he was assigned vice commander of the Continental Air Command at Mitchell AFB, Long Island.

General Hall was appointed Assistant Chief of Staff for Reserve Forces at Air Force Headquarters in September 1953—serving in that capacity until his assignment as CONAC's commander at Mitchell on July 1, 1957.

His decorations include the Legion of Merit, Bronze Star, and Air Medal.

He is married to the former Marguerite Higgins, New York Herald Tribune journalist.

University of South Carolina's First All-American Walked Into Rex's Office

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 1, 1961

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I attach here an article about a constituent of mine, Mr. Louis Sossaman, of Gaffney, S.C., and in the article, which I attach, is a story of the greatness of this man as an athlete and the fine citizenship and example he has continued in his hometown of Gaffney. I think this article deserves the interest of all of us as an example that this young man is an example of the youth of today:

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH CAROLINA'S FIRST ALL-AMERICAN WALKED INTO REX'S OFFICE

(By Bill Rone)

GAFFNEY. — America's college football coaches recruit players far and wide, sparing no expense to lure agile behemoths to their campuses.

It is significant, therefore, that the University of South Carolina's first all-American walked into the late Coach Rex Enright's office and asked for a chance to play.

Enright, though unimpressed with the youngster's size, was agreeable. Rex didn't know it at the time, but his OK erased all problems at the center position for the next 4 years.

The clean-cut youngster with rimless glasses was Louis C. Sossaman, of Gaffney. After the 1942 season, Soss was named second-string center on the Associated Press all-American team, a pinnacle reached by no gamecock before him. That in itself should be ample testimony.

But Sossaman, a murderous blocker and tackler, although he never weighed more than 200 pounds, went on to star in service and professional football and establish himself as one of the most outstanding football players ever produced by this State.

The Sossaman saga begins on June 2, 1921, when he was born in Gaffney, long one of South Carolina's hotbeds of prep football. His was a newspaper family. Grandfather was the redoubtable Ed DeCamp, one of the men who produced the first edition of the State on February 18, 1891.

Later he went to Gaffney and founded the Ledger and the Grit and Steel, the latter a game chicken magazine that is being still circulated nationally. Lou's father, F. W. Sossaman, assumed control of the Ledger in 1926 and, at 74, is still at the reins.

Lou was a young kid when he acquired a hero—the famed "Galloping Ghost of Gaffney," Earl Clary. He remembers that a football scoreboard was erected in a vacant lot on the main drag. When Clary-led Gaffney High played on the road, large crowds would gather in the lot and await scores via telegraph. Great roars would go up when Gaffney scored.

Just hooked, Sossaman went out for football as soon as he reached high school in 1936. He was a center from the beginning, but at first he was a tiny one—130 pounds.

His first game was not exactly indicative of the future. His dad likes to tell this story:

The Gaffney B team, with young Lou clad in an out-sized uniform, went to Bolling Springs for a game. The field there measured only 90 yards. When a team reached the end, the ball would be placed back 10

yards and they had to be negotiated before a TD was signaled.

Despite its odd field, Bolling Springs had a bunch of rough tough country boys. Gaffney was having trouble. Finally, in the huddle, the quarterback said, "Soss, open up a hole for us in the middle."

The reply was not brimming with confidence. "I can't open up anything. You'd better go around."

Gaffney didn't have to "go around" for long however. The 1937 and 1938 teams, with Sossaman in the forefront swept the boards.

The undefeated 1938 club accepted an invitation to play Fort Union Military Academy in the Little Tobacco Bowl in Richmond, Va. Gaffney lost 7 to 0 and the winning touchdown was scored on an extremely unusual but quite legal maneuver.

"In all of my 14 years of football and many others as an official, I have only seen the play once. It's the return kick. We punted to Fork Union. The receiver caught the ball, ran a little bit, and then—boom. He punted it back to us, over our heads and dead on the 2-yard line. We couldn't get out of the hole, lost the ball, and they scored."

Sossaman also played in the second annual Shrine Bowl at Charlotte that year. He broke his shoulder on the second half kickoff, but Enright and Ted Petoskey of the USC staff expressed some interest in him in a postgame chat.

He went back to Gaffney and was graduated in January. The only college recruiter to visit him was a coach at the University of Tennessee, who dismissed Lou as too small for college ball. (He weighed 180 then.)

Shortly thereafter, Sossaman accompanied his parents to Columbia for a press association meeting. While they were thus occupied, Lou walked down to the fieldhouse for his fateful meeting with Enright.

He entered Carolina at the semester break and was thus able to participate in the spring training of 1939. The next year saw him playing freshman ball for Petoskey.

When he joined the varsity for the 1940 season, there were some fine players around—Al Grygo, Stan Stascia, Cutch Elston, John Leitner and Bobo Carter, to name a few.

"If the war hadn't come along, we would have had a fine team before we were finished," Sossaman said recently.

Sossaman won a regular job immediately, aided, he admits, by the fact that one center hurt a knee and another went into the service. "We were mostly 60-minute men," he added with a note of pride.

The Gamecocks didn't do so well in the won-lost column however. Sossaman best remembers the game in which the 1942 club, which he captained, tied Tennessee's Sugar Bowl team.

Despite University of South Carolina's so-so record, Sossaman was not ignored. He made all-State and all-Southern Conference in each of his 3 years and was the Associated Press No. 2 all-American center in 1942.

Then came the service years. He went to Bainbridge (Md.) Naval Training Station as an apprentice seaman but quickly rose to the rating of chief specialist A (for athletics) and wound up commanding a boot company.

But of more interest is the fact that he played for the famous Bainbridge Commodores, a powerful service team that went undefeated for two seasons.

This team launched Charlie Justice to national fame. I always like to say the man carrying the ball is his own blocker, and Charlie was the perfect example. He could really set up a block for you.

Also around were Furman's Dewey Proctor (one of the hardest running backs I ever hit), Bill DeCorrevant (the Northwestern All-American), Buster Ramsey (now coach of the pro Buffalo Bills) and Red Hickey (the current San Francisco 49'er coach). It was quite a club.

Sossaman was transferred to Pearl Harbor but the war ended shortly. To entertain themselves and the troops, Sossaman and a few other right fair athletes in Hawaii organized Army, Navy, and Marine baseball and football teams and played on alternate days.

Who were these right fair athletes? Well, to name a few in the close-knit group, there were Schoolboy Rowe, John Pesky, Ted Williams, and Stan Musial (the nicest all-around guy I have ever met).

On his return to San Francisco, Sossaman was immediately signed by Dan Topping, now owner of the baseball Yankees, then owner of the New York Yanks in the newly formed and ill-fated all-American pro football conference.

Sossaman did a 3-year tour with the Yanks and each year they met and lost to the Cleveland Browns in the championship playoff. He was a regular center.

Both the baseball and football Yanks played in the stadium.

Sossaman and family alternated in a nearby apartment with the Yogi Berras, the Sossamans moving in after baseball season.

They became friends. Yogi gave the bat he used in Don Larsen's perfect game to Lou's son Cody. Needless to say, the Sossamans are perhaps the most violent Yankee fans in Gaffney.

There are quite a few parallels in Lou's family life. He married a Carolina cheerleader, Kathryn Edgerton of Columbia and Orangeburg.

Kathryn's father was Dr. Bruce (Red) Edgerton, a star center at Davidson. It is said that he was the first center to drop back out of the line to the linebacker position.

While Dr. Edgerton was establishing his medical practice in Columbia, he served as head coach for 4 years at Carolina (1912-15), compiling a 19-13-3 record with such stars as Fritz von Kolnitz and Luke Hill.

And if there have been two centers in the family, it also has its share of cheerleaders. Following Mama in this activity are 15-year-old Kit and 13-year-old Polly, the pert Sossaman daughters.

In the office of the Gaffney Ledger (Lou is now the advertising manager and a columnist), hangs a large photo showing Lou dumping a runner upside down while playing with the Yanks. Made by Ernest Sisto of the New York Times and entitled "The Gentle Art," it was named the "sports picture of the year."

Attached to the photo is this printed legend: "If you say you can or you can't, you're right."

Lou Sossaman years ago said he could—and he did.

The Shrinking Dollar

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH HARVEY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 1, 1961

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following articles from the Washington Daily News of July 31, 1961, and the Christian Science Monitor of July 29, 1961.

[From the Washington Daily News, July 31, 1961]

THE SHRINKING DOLLAR

(By Lyle C. Wilson)

The most important dollar ever inherited by John-Fitzgerald Kennedy was the U.S.

buck bequeathed to him by the Eisenhower administration.

That dollar was a beat up bit of paper which had been inherited by Dwight D. Eisenhower from Harry S. Truman. H. S. T. got it from F. D. R.

To understand the importance of this Presidential dollar, it is necessary to agree on the moment of time when this dollar was in good health and capable of buying 100 cents worth of goods and services. The Senate Finance Committee fixes this moment of time in the year 1939. This is an arbitrary choice but a good one.

It puts the dollar to the severest test of the past 22 years. So it is that F. D. R. in 1939 had in his wallet a U.S. dollar worth 100 cents. Harry S. Truman inherited that dollar along with the Presidency in 1945. It had shrunk by then in value to less than 79 cents.

Conservative-minded citizens became alarmed. Everybody's dollar had shrunk in pace with the dollar in F. D. R.'s pocket. The prudent family man with a savings account, bonds, or a life insurance policy had suffered in 6 years at least a 21-percent levy on his capital. This probably represented the grandest larceny of all time. There was more to come.

When Harry S. Truman handed the presidential dollar on to Dwight D. Eisenhower that U.S. buck was worth about 52 cents. F. D. R. and Mr. Truman were big spenders. Each had a war in his lap, however, and much of the dollar-busting deficit spending sponsored by those two Presidents was for survival defense.

General Eisenhower was a bigtime spender, too, and he did not stop the rotting of the U.S. dollar. General Eisenhower slowed the disease, however, and handed over to John F. Kennedy a dollar worth about 46 cents. That is the way it has been.

F. D. R.'s healthy 1939 dollar is gravely ill. The illness has developed in step with a long and almost uninterrupted series of deficit years in the operation of the U.S. Government. These deficits require enormous borrowing to pay Government bills. There has been a relentless growth of the national debt toward \$300 billion, an incomprehensible figure.

This deficit spending seems to have been bad medicine for the ailing U.S. dollar. President Kennedy and Treasury Secretary C. Douglas Dillon evidently believe this is good medicine. They will dose the dollar with a \$7 billion deficit this year. The President needs a great lot of new defense money and he plans to borrow that and to borrow more for other purposes.

He may ask for higher taxes next January. But he is not talking in terms of cutting Government costs and preventing deficit spending by economy in postponable nondefense areas. Those are politically sensitive areas, untouchable except at great political risk.

The facts of simple arithmetic suggest something which should jolt all deficit spenders, past and present. From 1939-61 inclusive the dollar lost purchasing power at the rate of 2.4 cents a year. At that rate, if Mr. Kennedy served two terms, he would pass on to the next President a dollar worth about 27 cents. Two-bit dollar, here we come.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, July 29, 1961]

TREND OF THE ECONOMY—THE POUND AND THE DOLLAR

(By Nate White)

BOSTON.—President Kennedy was correct when he reported to the people of the United States that their economy was fully able to handle the increased cost of the Berlin buildup.

The economy contains excess capacity and excess manpower. It has enormous absorption content. It can take a lot.

The President is incorrect, however, if he reads the economic situation as shipshape. It is not. The Nation's international monetary position is in the most sensitive balance it has even been. Every ounce of the Nation's gold is pledged to international obligations. The defense buildup, plus the stress on pound sterling, can unbalance this sensitive situation. There is evidence this process is beginning.

President Kennedy's chief economic adviser, Dr. Walter W. Heller, Chairman of the White House Council of Economic Advisers, said in Bonn July 27 that if the United States must establish large numbers of Armed Forces overseas "a very substantial balance-of-payments problem" would occur, and that the 40-percent hike in the British bank rate was "a very drastic measure."

The New York Times editorially noted July 27 that "clearly there are severe economic problems that may arise, even in the near future. The possible problem area that needs to be watched most closely for the present is the position of the dollar on world markets."

The American economy's recovery from the 1960 recession is first rate. President Kennedy reported that the bounce back was better than any in the past 20 years.

It is important to note, however, that the bounce back actually began before any of the antirecessionary measures of the Kennedy administration could have had any economic impact. It was a natural bounce back and confirms the attractive theory of Dr. Arthur F. Burns, the leading specialist in business cycles, that the economy is in an expanding upward natural trend.

Dr. Burns assailed what he termed the "neostagnationist" theories of the Kennedy economists.

Looking back at the Kennedy team's descriptions of the economy early this year is interesting. The economy was described as containing "chronic slackness," that it was "sluggish and tired," that "the sad fact is our last recovery was an anemic one," that "we combat basic sluggishness" in "a disappointingly slack economy," that a "grave economic challenge confronts our economic system," that "stagnation in the American economy can prevent us from making those improvements in our industrial productivity," * * * "a sagging economy," and so on.

The language and the attitude were grim. Just 3 months later the Kennedy team was talking about a budget surplus of \$10 billion in fiscal 1963. Early in June the team was about \$2 billion under in its forecast of the budget deficit for the fiscal year just past.

With an economic team so out of focus it is not safe for the American people to assume that the economy is not in a state of risk. The risk is not domestic. The risk is international, and this risk is great.

In the international sphere the United States is running on current account. No one is currently starting a run on the bank, yet the possibility exists. International speculators are not usually motivated by patriotism. The potential for speculation at the expense of the United States was never greater. This threat, plus the current tourist spending abroad, plus the arms buildup can easily deplete the gold which must be sustained to meet international obligations.

The Treasury should be building up its gold not depleting it.

The facts of international economics seem lost on the American public.

But the fact is just this simple: The Nation is on current account. It must pay as it goes. It must increase its productivity. It must step up its competitiveness. And it should be alert to the inherent threat to the

United States from European central bankers, international speculators in gold, and the rapidly increasing competitiveness and gold strength of the European Common Market.

The times call for the pound and the dollar to stand together. They are now fighting each other. But the move is up to America. The administration has not taken the lead necessary to strengthen the pound, and the British Government has been compelled to take protective steps. The winds across the Atlantic can change overnight. And they have.

California VFW Endorses House Joint Resolution 447

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN R. PILLION

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 1, 1961

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Speaker, I previously called to the attention of this House the endorsement of House Joint Resolution 447 by the New York State convention of Veterans of Foreign Wars.

I am most pleased to place before this Congress a most effective endorsing resolution adopted by the California Department of the Veterans of Foreign Wars at its 41st annual convention.

The text of the resolution follows:

FORTY-FIRST ANNUAL CONVENTION, DEPARTMENT OF CALIFORNIA, VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS OF THE UNITED STATES—A CALL TO ACTION

(Resolution 74, 1961, in support of the Pillion resolution, H.J. Res. 447, expressing a declaration of war against the 98 Communist Parties constituting the international Communist conspiracy)

Whereas on July 12, 1961, Representative JOHN R. PILLION, of New York, introduced in the U.S. Congress, House Joint Resolution 447 and the purpose of the resolution is to mobilize all of our Nation's resources to meet and defeat the 98 Communist Parties, allied with and dominated by the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, which are waging a total war against the United States and all free peoples; and

Whereas the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States has historically been on record in total opposition to the Communist philosophy; and

Whereas the gentleman from New York appears to have projected a positive approach with which to combat a false ideology; and

Whereas the fate of his resolution is dependent upon registering support for his resolution with the leaders of our Government: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Department of California, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, in convention assembled in the city of Sacramento, Calif., does hereby endorse House Joint Resolution 447, 87th Congress; does request that the news media of this State publicize this House Joint Resolution 447, which was introduced only a few weeks ago; does request that all civic and patriotic organizations in California adopt similar resolutions, calling upon their members to register their individual support of this House joint resolution; and does call upon all patriotic Americans to join with the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, Department of California, by immediately advising the President of the United States at

the White House in Washington, D.C., the U.S. Senators at the Senate Office Building in Washington, D.C., and the Members of Congress at the House Office Building in Washington, D.C., of their support of House Joint Resolution 447.

Adopted on July 18, 1961, by the 41st annual convention, Department of California, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.

ORVILLE LOFTON,
Department Commander.

Attest:

ROBERT J. MUTT,
Department Adjutant.

The Soviet Challenge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 1, 1961

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, a great deal of attention is being focused these days on the new draft program which Premier Khrushchev is planning to present to the 22d Congress of the Soviet Communist Party in October.

While this new policy program emphasizes economic goals for the Soviet Union, it is far more than an economic document; it is, as the Washington Post so clearly stated it this morning, "a political blueprint which makes it altogether clear that coexistence, as proclaimed from Moscow, is an instrument of world revolution."

The Post goes on to point out:

The principal lesson of the draft program is to emphasize again that the basic Soviet challenge will continue irrespective of what happens on Berlin. It is a challenge that we must inevitably meet, a challenge that pervades every facet of existence and a challenge that may very well be with us all our lifetime.

Mr. Speaker, this is an extremely timely article, and I urge my colleagues to give it their close attention:

COEXISTENCE AS A WEAPON

Mr. McCloy's report to the President on his talks with the mercurial Mr. Khrushchev has as a backdrop the new draft program of the Soviet Communist Party. There is nothing in that document to suggest that, even if the Berlin crisis can be allayed by diplomatic means, relations between the Soviet Union and the West are going to become any happier.

If the Communist chieftains in Moscow were content to concentrate upon the improvement of living standards among the people—a big point in the heady promises—most of the rest of the world would wish the experiment well. There would still be much dislike of the method, but that would be primarily the business of the Soviet people. The fact that the program aims explicitly at surpassing the United States in production would be of interest as a stimulus here, but not of vast security concern.

The Communist program is far more than an economic testament, however; it is really a political blueprint. It redefines the Communist intention to take over the world, and the purpose is only slightly less sinister because the doctrine appears to reject world war as something that may not be necessary.

For the document makes it altogether clear that "coexistence" as proclaimed from Moscow is an instrument of world revolution. Non-Communist societies presumably are expected to submit meekly to the inevitable; there will be trouble only if they resist, as in Berlin. In almost one breath the draft talks of "equality, mutual understanding and trust between countries; consideration of mutual interests; noninterference in internal affairs," and then of peaceful coexistence which "serves as a basis for the peaceful competition between socialism and capitalism on an international scale and constitutes a specific form of class struggle between them."

Rarely has the tactic been stated so candidly. Nor are the fulminations directed entirely at capitalist imperialism, although it receives the major critique. The program also alludes to the dangers of revisionism, naming explicitly Yugoslavia, and the dangers of dogmatism and sectarianism, which presumably are to be found in China.

Experts may well debate the economic meaning of the draft. It is noteworthy that the promises to the Soviet people, while lavish—a classless society, no rent, no heavy labor, adequate housing for practically everyone, and so on—are conspicuously vague as to timing. The utopian society is not yet. Indeed, some analysts see in the failure specifically to mention a shift from heavy industry to consumer goods some retrenchment from Mr. Khrushchev's earlier promises.

Despite the hostile tone of most of the document, on one point its analysis carries a useful warning. "Anticommunism," it says, "has brought social reformism to an ideological and political impasse. This is one of the main reasons for the crisis of social democracy"—which the doctrine equates with bourgeois decadence. Then charge is by no means universally true; indeed, there has been a reawakening of social reform, particularly in Latin America. But it is certainly true that the democratic answer to the obsessive fervor of the Communists must be something more positive than a sterile anticommunism.

All of this has been laid down as a preliminary to the 22d Congress of the Soviet Communist Party which meets in Moscow on October 17. That meeting constitutes a deadline of sorts, for Mr. Khrushchev obviously is focusing his efforts upon it. If the West is to put forward its own ideas and mount counterpressures for diplomatic negotiation to settle the Berlin crisis, they ought to be well under way before then. The long-range Soviet strategy does not rule out the possibility of mutual-interest accommodation short of war.

But the principal lesson of the draft program is to emphasize again that the basic Soviet challenge will continue irrespective of what happens on Berlin. It is a challenge that we must inevitably meet, a challenge that pervades every facet of existence, and a challenge that may well be with us all our lifetime.

Businessmen's Responsibility in Public Affairs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ROBERT DOLE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 1, 1961

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Speaker, recently a noted business leader, Mr. Charles R. Barr, of Standard Oil Co., of Indiana,

delivered a speech before the 74th annual convention of the Michigan Savings and Loan League on the subject of the political responsibilities and obligations of businessmen in public affairs.

Mr. Barr was born on a Kansas farm in 1916 and educated in its public schools. He later received his law degree from Washburn University in Topeka. Kansas is proud of the many businessmen who have gained national prominence and it is with pride I submit Mr. Barr's speech and commend it to the attention of my colleagues:

BUSINESS'S RESPONSIBILITY IN PUBLIC AFFAIRS
(By Charles R. Barr, Standard Oil Co. (Indiana); executive president, Effective Citizens Organization; member, U.S. Chamber of Commerce Political Participation Committee; adviser, public affairs committee of the National Association of Manufacturers, presented before Michigan Savings and Loan League 74th annual convention, Grand Hotel, Mackinac Island, July 18, 1961)

It is a privilege to have the opportunity to be with you this morning to discuss public affairs and the role of businessmen in it.

Before we enter into any discussion of this topic, I think it would be well to pause a moment and review why we should be interested in the political affairs of our country. Much has been said about our national goals or lack thereof. Our national goals can be achieved only through a sound political system. Those who have said that we have no national goals have a woeful lack of knowledge of the development of our country. Our goals and purposes were clearly spelled out by our forefathers in the Declaration of Independence. Who can forget the ringing words of this sacred document which declares in part:

"We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness. That to secure these rights, Governments are instituted among Men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed."

No one has defined a goal more clearly. These goals were subsequently further developed in the Constitution of the United States, in which our forefathers declared their goals, "to form a more perfect Union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquillity, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity." Those goals were further defined in the Bill of Rights providing for freedom of religion, of speech, of the press, of the right to assemble, the right to petition, the right to bear arms, protection of private property, the right of due process of law, the right of a speedy trial by jury and many other provisions. Our country has since extended our goals by the enactment of 12 other amendments to the Constitution. Other goals have been set out in such documents as President Monroe's Monroe Doctrine, and by Lincoln's unforgettable Gettysburg Address, and in the laws and treaties of our land made pursuant to the Constitution. Millions of Americans have shed their blood on many battlefields to reach and preserve our objectives. Millions more have made their sacrifices in other ways to reach the high plane of civilization which we have achieved. It is startling, in view of the clarity with which we have set forth our goals in documents and deeds, that anyone could wonder about our national purpose. In view of the great sacrifices made by millions of people to achieve and preserve our goals, it is difficult to believe that anyone

could doubt for a moment his own individual obligation to work and sacrifice to further enhance the achievement of even higher goals and to preserve this political system which has given us the finest fruits of civilization ever enjoyed by mankind.

Today I want to talk about the political responsibilities and obligations of a particular group of our citizens. I want to talk about that group classified as businessmen and their participation in public affairs. Businessmen have a long tradition of participating in the field of public affairs of our country. Our founders for the most part, were business and professional men like Washington, Jefferson, Franklin, Adams, and Hamilton, who risked and pledged their lives, their liberty, and their honor to achieve their goals. The men who subsequently led in the development of our great political system, were also by and large, men of similar background, dedicated to the development of our Nation. Tragically, some 25 or 30 years ago, there began to be some evidence that a large number of members of the business community were leaving political affairs "up to George." George often seemed to have ideas that were not compatible with the continued development and enhancement of the principles which made our country the envy and the model of the free world. Because of the forfeiture and neglect of accepting political responsibility on the part of more and more businessmen, our political system has more and more fallen into the hands of those who seem to worship principles and ideologies contrary to those which made this country's high standards possible. Too often high ideals and purposes have been neglected and political interest and activity has been aimed primarily for the selfish benefit of special groups with the goal of what they could take out of government. If this trend continues, then our free political system and all that it means in the way of freedom and of a sound economic system will soon perish. Anyone who has taken time to read a little history must be aware of the tragic roles of other democracies and republics long demised, where high principles gave way solely to the pursuit of selfish interests by myriads of solely self-seeking interests. Our forefathers were aware of this danger. Benjamin Franklin was acutely aware of it when, after the signing of the Declaration of Independence he said, "We have given you a republic, if you can keep it."

We have kept and developed that Republic amazingly well to date. But now we see more and more attempts to take liberty and rights from our people in return for a dole or a subsidy. We see more and more of the fruit of our efforts taken from us by the tax collector and all about us we see evidence of the degeneration of large segments of our population whose particular goal in life appears to be to live off the fruits of other people's efforts by using their vote solely to gain economic advantage for themselves. There is substantial evidence that certain groups are using their franchise as a method of confiscating property and rights from others via the route of taxation. The ones whose labors are being robbed increasingly year by year with the meeting of every Congress and legislature, are those who produce the goods and services of this Nation, all of whom I would classify as businessmen, whether they work at a lathe or whether they manage the plant. Why then the lack of resistance? I believe that there are several answers to this question:

1. Many of us have come to take our way of life for granted and have forgotten "the price of liberty is eternal vigilance."

2. Because of insidious propaganda emanating from many sources and because our system has not reached perfection, many members of the business community apparently have lost faith in themselves and their system.

3. In the race for competitive advantage among businessmen, they have tended to avoid anything controversial for fear that it may affect sales. Politics is controversial and no one can indulge in it to any extent for any period of time without getting a bloody nose.

Our forefathers risked everything they had to develop this country but today we find all too many people unwilling to risk criticism or the loss of a customer or client in order to stand up for principles which make their business possible in the first place. Many businessmen have developed a tendency to hide behind and to use specialists such as lawyers, public relations people, and lobbyists to do work which they ought to be doing themselves to a large extent. This is not to say that these specialists are not necessary and desirable in our complex society, but they need help and they need it badly. Too often we seem to think that because we belong to an association whose job it is to protect our particular industry, we don't have to do anything more, or that because we have created an advertising and public relations program which has developed a good image of our own particular group, that we have nothing to worry about.

Sound government is created at the grassroots. Grassroots are the precincts where you and I live. This is where votes are decided upon, where they are cast and where they are counted. There is probably not a precinct in America that is not populated by a substantial number of businessmen and their families. Until such time as these people are willing to sell the principles of sound government to their neighbors and friends, to take responsibility and leadership in their own communities, it is not going to be possible to have a sound political system. If our political system becomes unsound, our economic system is going to fall. We are going to lose our rights and liberties and as surely as night follows day, we will follow Rome and ancient Greece into the ashes of history.

Now, what specifically can we as businessmen do? I have some suggestions:

1. We must rededicate ourselves to the ideals and principles of our forefathers. We must match the diligence and spirit which sustained them.

2. We must take our share of leadership in our own communities in the political party of our choice by giving of our time, our talent, and our substance. We must encourage others to follow our example.

Now, assuming that some of you gentlemen decide to do this, what are some of the problems that you may expect to find? First, I am sure that you will find a lot of apathy. Second, you will probably find in many instances that political participation is not the social "thing to do." This is one of the greatest hurdles to overcome and it is only through leadership of responsible people like yourself that this stigma can be overcome. If political participation ever becomes popular and the "thing to do," then our battle is at least half won. Third, you will be surprised at how many people fail to register and vote. Some of these people fail to vote because they are apathetic or lazy, or just do not know why they should vote. Many people in the business community are unable to vote because of their transitory nature, from one community to another. All people should be interested in modernization of the laws to reduce the number of those people who are disenfranchised because of the transitory nature of our society. Let me spell out in some detail what you can do to be politically effective as a leader in your community.

1. Join a party and become identified with it; find out who the local leaders are, such as precinct captains, judges of election, local officeholders, etc. They are all neighbors of yours and probably you know most of them.

2. Voluntarily ask them what you can do to help and, if they are doing a good job, encourage them and let them know you appreciate their efforts.

3. If an opportunity comes to serve in your capacity in their political organization, accept it—don't sluff it off on George. Encourage others to do the same thing.

4. Be willing to give some time, talent, and money to this effort.

Once you have done this, then you will have the right and probably an opportunity to be heard in higher councils and to become a real influence for good, sound government. Enter politics and work for sound, general principles, and not merely for narrow interests which may affect you personally, because then you only become another special interest working for self-gain.

I think it is important that anybody entering this area get a proper perspective and put first things first. Few will quarrel with me when I say that first, we should all serve our God and stand only for those principles and rules which have been developed through a long period of His teaching; second, I think you will agree, is our obligation to our country, and we should never knowingly stand for any principle contrary to its best interests, followed closely by our interest and loyalty to those principles which will preserve and develop our families. Then, perhaps, we can think about the special problems that concern our own method of livelihood. If we really work and achieve sound principles for God, country and family, we are seldom going to have to worry very much about good economic principles for our own business enterprises. I suppose what I am really advocating is for each of us to start our own do-it-yourself program in public affairs.

Finally, as businessmen, we can all do a job of selling our political and economic system to our employees, to our associates and our friends. There are millions of people that no one has ever taken the trouble to tell where they fit into the scheme of things and how they benefit from this great country of ours. Liberty is like water. Too often we don't miss it until the well goes dry.

Let us stand up and speak up for what we believe.

We should not be like the parrot whose story so well illustrates the points that I have been trying to make. A merchant had long desired to own a fine parrot. One day, as he was walking to work, he noticed a fine parrot in a pet shop window. He entered the store and asked the manager about the bird and was told that it was an extraordinary bird and could speak seven different languages—the finest bird that he had ever seen. The businessman asked the price and after some negotiation, bought the bird and a cage for \$35 and had it delivered to his home. When he returned that evening and met his wife at the door, he asked if his parrot had arrived and she said that it had. He asked where it was and she advised him that it had been in the oven for about 30 minutes and would be ready to be served in another hour. The husband shouted, "My good woman. That was a very expensive and talented bird that could speak fluently in seven different languages. Why in the world are you baking it?" To which his wife replied, "Well, why didn't he speak up?"

Unlike the parrot, the businessmen of America had better speak up.

Don't leave the preservation of this country up to others, but as I said before, start a do-it-yourself program of your own for the benefit of yourself and the generations to come. I am sure that you will get a great deal of personal satisfaction from it and you will leave a heritage far greater than the wealth of the Andes.

We must act. We must speak out.

Imports Destroy Local Industry and Nurture Widespread Unemployment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 12, 1961

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, it is always a privilege to be able to associate myself with the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY] on matters pertaining to international trade. His long record of support for American industry and labor against the crushing impact of imported goods produced by workers whose wages are shamefully low is recognized and admired in Pennsylvania as much as in his own State.

I am happy to find that the West Virginia State Legislature has taken an active interest in the U.S. Tariff Commission investigation initiated because of the losses sustained by America's glass industry to unfair foreign competition. Western Pennsylvania has also felt the effects of unrealistic tariff policies that permit imported glass and other consumer items to destroy local industry and nurture widespread unemployment and hardship. Other State legislatures should be encouraged to take similar action. Perhaps Congress, when the voice of the people at home becomes sufficiently loud and clear through such media as State legislatures, will finally make restitution for the surrender of its constitutionally delegated power over international commerce.

We who have been exposed to the impoverishments of our communities through irresponsible trade policies are quick to appreciate any decisions by the Tariff Commission that are beneficial to the economy of this country. Decisions of this nature are so few and far between, however, that there is seldom an occasion for jubilation. It is particularly distressing when a favorable Tariff Commission recommendation is rejected by the White House, although such procedure has come to be expected in recent years.

It would seem past time, Mr. Speaker, that Members of Congress accept the fact that present foreign trade policies are entirely inadequate, indefensible, and inane. Even under most satisfactory conditions, the Tariff Commission is without authority to provide the kind of protection American industry and labor must have for proper development and moderate prosperity.

We most assuredly welcome whatever consideration the Tariff Commission proffers. Nonetheless, Members of this legislative body who are dissatisfied with the executive department's arrogation of authority over trade policy, who object to the displacement of American workers through reckless importation of commodities from abroad, and who recognize the long-term damage involved in a program that gives precedence to foreign exporters over domestic considerations; those of us who consider

America's economy and defense our first responsibility must join together in drawing up a set of rules not presently being observed. Congress can no longer stand by and watch national welfare be sacrificed in favor of so-called diplomacy. Opening markets without regard to the effect on employment in this country was a connivance of the disciples of internationalism which has not only failed to win us more friends, but in actuality has produced a healthier grade of enemies. Russia's current invasion of energy markets in Europe, Africa, South America, and the Far East is lending emphasis to the futility of this country's attempts to purchase friendship with either hard cash or soft import policies.

There is also danger of supply gaps in all industries whose capacity to meet mobilization requirements is being depleted by competition from abroad. Glass is a good example. When a growing ratio of domestic demand is met by foreign supplies, America's own glass production is stunted instead of moving forward with the growth in population and rise in living standards. The glass industry finds it impossible to continue at normal operational levels when its markets are overrun by products shipped in from overseas. Glassworkers must seek employment in other industries, sometimes far removed geographically. If an emergency comes and imports are cut off, the domestic glass industry could not be expected to meet the sharply accelerated requirements.

Here is where we must make the decision to be sure that there will be no supply gaps under mobilization conditions. Whatever the product—glass, oil, coal, machine tools, pottery—Congress must erect the necessary safeguards. You name it. There are few congressional districts where the impact of unfair foreign competition has not been felt. I invite my colleagues to join me and my distinguished colleague from West Virginia in our long battle for a logical foreign trade policy. With the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act expiring a year hence, now is a most appropriate time to serve notice on the executive department that future trade pacts must be made in favor of America's industries and labor instead of assorted peoples whose only interest in us is what our Government can do for them.

U.S. Airways Deal With Soviet Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN B. DOOLEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 1, 1961

Mr. DOOLEY. Mr. Speaker, while war clouds gather over the Berlin problem and the United States and Soviet Russia flex their muscles, there is a peaceful negotiation transpiring at the present between these two great nations which deserve our attention.

I refer to the bargaining which has begun for air routes between New York and Moscow.

It so happens that a constituent of mine—James M. Landis, of Harrison—will be chief negotiator for the United States. It is to be hoped by all that he will do a good job, in conjunction with our State Department, and make certain that we do not end up short changed, as has been the case in air bilateral discussions so often in the past.

Mr. Speaker, the Mount Vernon Argus, one of the leading newspapers in my district, recently carried an excellent editorial on this subject. Under unanimous consent, I make this editorial a part of the RECORD:

U.S. AIRWAYS DEAL WITH SOVIET RUSSIA

Representatives of Russia and the United States are scheduled to meet tomorrow to discuss a commercial air treaty between the two countries.

Two airlines are involved.

One is Pan American World Airways, a privately owned American corporation with some 40,000 stockholders. Pan American must earn its own way.

The other is Aeroflot, which is a department of the Soviet Government and an arm of the Red air force. Aeroflot has no stockholders, is not designed to be self-supporting, is fully subsidized by Moscow.

Yet, theoretically, these two lines will compete for patronage under whatever agreement may be reached between the two governments.

But, unless that agreement records a new high in American diplomatic negotiation, Pan American competition with Aeroflot will follow the pattern of our "competition" with Russia in all other areas of international trade. We do business on a free enterprise basis, Russia uses government-financed trade as an instrument of economic warfare.

Incidentally, whether or not Pan American can be assured of a deal under which its service to and from Russia can survive will depend largely on a Westchester man—James M. Landis of Harrison, who, as special assistant to President Kennedy, heads the U.S. negotiating team.

Mr. Landis is equipped, by training and experience, to do a good job for us.

But he will be only a negotiator, presumably required to consult Washington as well as Pan American every step of the way.

The Soviets will be represented by Col. Gen. Y. F. Loginov, who is boss of Aeroflot, a top officer of the Red air force, and final spokesman for his government in this situation.

So it looks as if—if an equitable arrangement, to say nothing of an advantageous one—is to be worked out for the United States, Mr. Landis must be prepared to do some very forceful table pounding.

Auto Financing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. GEORGE MEADER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 1, 1961

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include the following editorial from the Jackson (Mich.) Citizen Patriot, of July 21, 1961:

HOW MUCH A MONTH

Representative CELLER's hearings on legislation looking to forcing Ford and General

Motors to shed their subsidiaries which extend credit to buyers of automobiles is putting many persons connected with this important industry into a slow burn.

Representative CELLER's record shows him to be one of the "bleeding heart" liberals who is against anything that is big and has anything to do with business. Merit often seems to be a matter of secondary concern.

And that seems to be true in the case of the hearings on the finance companies owned by the automobile makers.

Those who do understand the industry, including Representative GEORGE MEADER, are upset because they feel the whole story has not been brought to light.

The simple truth is that a great number of consumers, when they go to make a major purchase, are interested in just one question: "How much a month?"

That applies to the sale of many items, appliances, and such, as well as to automobiles. To sell the dealer has to have a ready answer. He must have a financing plan available so the buyer can sign his name, make his down payment, or leave the old junker for that purpose, and take home his new washing machine, television set or automobile.

The automobile manufacturers got into financing early as a matter of necessity. When they began to tap the mass markets, the Nation's financial system simply was not geared or accustomed to time payment buying.

Today the buyer with a respectable credit rating has his choice of sources for the money he needs for installment buying. He is not a captive of the financing companies owned by the auto makers. Commercial banks bid openly for his business, as do other financing companies. Credit unions take care of many others.

Thus no real issue of monopoly is involved. Rather, the existence of the financing companies owned by the automobile concerns is a sort of an insurance against monopoly.

In fact, it appears that the harassment of these systems is more or less a matter of penalizing enterprise.

Illinois Legislature Favors GI Education Benefits to All Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 27, 1961

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith House Joint Resolution 13 of the State of Illinois 72d General Assembly:

STATE OF ILLINOIS, 72D GENERAL ASSEMBLY,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

House Joint Resolution 13 (offered by Messrs. Choate, Dunne, Harris, Downes, Craig, Benefiel, Allen Lucas, Ropa, Romano, Pfeffer, Ratcliffe, Scott, Powell, Schaefer, Rink, Russell, R. J. Welsh, Morris, Wendt, Baker, Redmond, and Carrigan)

Whereas millions of veterans of World War II and the Korean conflict have been educated under the provisions of the veterans education program established by the Federal Government; and

Whereas many veterans were able to obtain further education through the benefits of the veterans education program which would not have been possible otherwise; and

Whereas the education of millions of veterans has contributed to an increase in the level of education of this country and has

produced a major national asset in better and more skilled manpower and has done much to improve the economy of our country; and

Whereas reliable statistics have proved that increased income to veterans resulting from higher education and improved skills will more than reimburse the National Treasury of the entire cost of the GI training program by 1970; and

Whereas the President of the United States, by Executive order of January 31, 1955, stopped the educational benefits for persons inducted into the Armed Forces of the United States after February 1, 1955; and

Whereas it is believed that as long as the draft is continued that all persons serving in the Armed Forces should be extended the educational benefits that were granted to veterans serving prior to February 1, 1955; and

Whereas the veteran education program has been an integral factor in strengthening the defense system of our country and the continuation of this program may be justified in terms of our educational ideas and needs; and

Whereas it has been established by reliable statistics that the investment in education for our own American youth will be more than repaid to the Public Treasury through increased taxes, resulting from higher incomes earned by such veterans: Therefore be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the 72d General Assembly of the State of Illinois (the Senate concurring herein), That the General Assembly of the State of Illinois does hereby memorialize the Congress of the United States to extend GI education benefits to all veterans who have entered or who will enter military service on or after February 1, 1955, and that such educational benefits be extended as long as the provision of the draft law shall exist; and that a copy of this resolution be mailed by the clerk of the house of representatives to the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, and to each Member of the Congress from the State of Illinois.

Adopted by the House, April 12, 1961.

PAUL POWELL,

Speaker, House of Representatives.

CHAS. F. KERVIN,

Clerk, House of Representatives.

Concurred in by the Senate, June 30, 1961.

SAMUEL H. SHAPIRO,

President of the Senate.

EDWARD E. FERNANDES,

Secretary of the Senate.

A New and Dramatic Concept of Foreign Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARROLL D. KEARNS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 1, 1961

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, the Meadville (Pa.) Tribune published an editorial approving of the SS *Hope*, a medical missionary ship from the United States.

According to the Meadville Tribune:

It has been hailed in every port it has visited for the work of its staff among the sick and diseased and for the training given to native doctors and nurses.

The editorial points out that the privately financed hospital ship has been

acclaimed because it brought help from the American people to people of foreign nations with no government intervention either on the giving or receiving end.

One Indonesian newspaper described the ship's visit as "tops on the list of mankind's hopes."

As we move toward consideration of the President's foreign aid proposals it would be well to consider the possibilities inherent in the *SS Hope* type of people-to-people aid.

I include here, for the information of my colleagues, the *Meadville Tribune* editorial to which I have referred:

LET THE PEOPLE DO IT

Associated Press Staff Writer Relman Morin reports that the *SS Hope*, a medical missionary ship from the United States, is exporting a new and dramatic concept of foreign aid. It has been hailed in every port it has visited for the work of its staff among the sick and diseased and for the training given to native doctors and nurses.

The privately financed hospital ship has been acclaimed because it brought help from the American people to people of foreign nations with no Government intervention either on the giving or receiving end. One Indonesian newspaper described the ship's visit as "tops on the list of mankind's hopes."

The U.S. Senate recently went on record in favor of establishment of a white fleet to provide prompt worldwide emergency aid to disaster victims. The Government's part in this project should be limited to making available ships now in mothballs, as it did with the *SS Hope*. But let the fleet be privately financed and operated so as not to destroy the potential goodwill value of people-to-people aid.

Freedom's Torch: House Joint Resolution 447

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF**

HON. JOHN R. PILLION

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 1, 1961

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Speaker, since the introduction of House Joint Resolution 447 on June 12, my office has received approximately 7,000 letters from citizens and organizations throughout this Nation. These messages have consistently expressed a fervent support for this resolution.

They are proof that our American people are far more aware of the Communist-Soviet threat than our Government has been.

The following letter is an example of popular support for House Joint Resolution 447:

May I thank you for the wonderful work you are doing with your recent resolution. More power to you. Surely you speak for many millions of thinking Americans, and we are carrying on an extensive letter writing campaign here in support of your resolution. We printed a half-page ad in last Sunday's *Post-Times* (West Palm Beach) with mail-in coupons for quick action by citizens.

I enclose a poem of mine on this very subject. I give you full permission to use it in any way you may wish in the cause of our beloved Republic.

The poem is an appropriate and inspirational expression of the resolute courage of our people:

FREEDOM'S TORCH

The torch burns low in a darkening land,
Where the enemy's footsteps steal,
Where the enemy moves in a shadowy band,
Where the enemy moves with a hideous zeal.

While America's leaders fail to stand.

Now cry ye out with a rousing cry,

Replenish the torch with oil.

Replenish the torch that is flickering dry,

Replenish the harvest of patriot's toil,

With the fiery light of that first July.

God, gird our men with a holy sword,

Awaken our household now.

Awaken them now to this perilous horde,

Awaken their souls to a thundering vow.

To triumph in battle for freedom warred.

Perish the base and the craven here,

These traitors defiling our time.

These traitors abiding in cowardly fear,

These traitors so drenched in their murderous crime.

As they knowingly builded our liberty's bier.

Hold high the torch on the mountain's height,

Rekindled to blind our foe.

Rekindled to guard with a radiant light,

Rekindled to blaze on the shining tableau.

Of America's power and America's might.

—Marjorie Niles Kime.

The Plight of Our International Airlines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD DAVIS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 1, 1961

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, our distinguished colleague from Oklahoma [Mr. JARMAN] has been calling our collective attention for many months to the plight of our international airlines. He has repeatedly warned us that unless our Government agencies practice greater restraint in handing out lush air routes to our competitors from abroad, our international commercial airlines will go the way of the American merchant marine.

Even now, Mr. Speaker, the Civil Aeronautics Board is considering, even proposing, additional certificated service at a time when our domestic industry is in trouble from too much competition from within, just as our oversea lines suffer from too much competition from without.

An interesting negotiation is proceeding at this very time, Mr. Speaker, involving air rights for flights between New York and Moscow. On one side is a privately owned, free-enterprise airline flying the U.S. flag—Pan American World Airways. On the other is the Government-owned and dominated Soviet carrier—Aeroflot.

Recently, our State Department people who negotiate these bilateral air agreements have displayed excellent judgment and impressive fortitude in dealing with foreign governments. We can be hopeful that they will be just as forceful in dealing with the Russians.

Mr. Speaker, a recent editorial in the *Memphis Commercial Appeal* graphically covered these current route discussions. I ask unanimous consent to make that editorial a part of the RECORD: [From the *Commercial Appeal*, July 17, 1961]

INTERNATIONAL AIR

Something extra special in the international air business begins tomorrow, with the first session on drawing up a treaty for a route between the United States and Russia.

The question is on what terms will a branch of the Russian Government compete against an investor-owned airline for this Nation's transatlantic air passengers.

The antagonists are Aeroflot, the Soviet airline, and Pan American World Airways.

The air fleet flying the American flag has been having a hard time against other fleets. Last year 64 percent of the international air passengers in and out of the United States were citizens of this country but our airlines, which used to carry 75 percent of them, now have barely half.

The treaties under which these foreign airlines come into the United States have been violated, the Civil Aeronautics Board has been told in formal petitions filed by our lines.

Now another treaty is in the making and the U.S. flag lines are trying to prevent both the specific troubles of previous air treaties and the general woes of the merchant freight ships flying our flag.

The Pan American attack, in advance of the hearing, puts special emphasis on the contrast between its own necessity of paying dividends to stockholders and the Aeroflot position. The Russian line is free from concern about how much a new plane costs, or how much is lost operating it.

Neither is the Aeroflot representative an observer at the treaty-making, as the Pan American man is. The head of the Russian delegation is at the same time the top man of Aeroflot, an officer of the air force and a part of his Government.

Much experience as Pan American has had in international competition and in the heavy hands of governments in other international air service, this is a new kind of contest.

And we expect a good many citizens of the United States, in addition to Pan American stockholders, are going to watch it with interest.

Omnibus Farm Bill: Fact or Fiction?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. GOODLING

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 1, 1961

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, the 1961 farm bill was passed in good faith, thinking it was all inclusive. It now develops passage should have been delayed 1 day in order that a new technological advance might have been studied and provisions made to regulate its use.

On the day this bill was passed a news release from England reported a new discovery which could have serious repercussions to our dairy industry. Surplus stocks of dried milk, cheese, and butter indicate milk is already in over supply. Think what might happen if this English discovery should become common practice among our U.S. dairymen without proper regulation. How many cows should be allowed to watch one set? In what position should the set be placed

in order to avoid undue eyestrain? Should we have color or black and white? It would be rather disconcerting to an animal to be shown a beautiful green pasture on a black and white set. At what hour should the sets be turned off in order that cows have sufficient rest?

Farm equipment is subject to yearly depreciation. Ways and Means might want to make a schedule of depreciation percentages which would be fair and equitable for an item not formerly considered farm equipment.

Sounds facetious, does it not—but is it any more so than the colossal flops many of our farm programs have been during the past 30 years? We take land out of production and the good farmer raises more bushels on what is left than he did originally on his entire acreage. We pay him not to grow crops from one pocket and from the other we pay him to reclaim land to grow more surpluses. Government pays farmers for applying lime to make the soil more productive, to grow more bushels—a practice good farmers have followed long before Government decided it knew more about farming than farmers themselves. We spend billions to build dams for other purposes and allow the water to be used for irrigation to reclaim arid land. We buy countless acres for dry dam flood control sites and lease the nontaxable land to grow supported crops in competition with the taxpaying farmer when that land should be used for recreational purposes until such time that it is needed for food production. We spend billions for production research and peanuts for marketing and distribution studies. We fill the pocket of the big operator and take pocket and all from the little fellow.

If having cows watch TV sounds silly, reflect on some farm programs, past and present, and draw your own conclusions on which makes more sense.

To understand what you have read, you must read what follows:

THE HOLSTEIN HOUR

There is a news story out of Axmouth, England, which may lead to some little confusion on Madison Avenue. The report involves a farmer who has installed television sets in his barn because he found that his cows gave more milk while watching television than they did while standing sullenly in barnish gloom. The complications possibly arising from this discovery become alarmingly evident.

If cows give more milk while watching TV, other farmers will take up the challenge and in turn install sets for their cows, and television may even become standard dairy equipment. Eventually society may be confronted in some areas with the rather bewildering possibility of a TV audience 60 percent cow and only 40 percent people.

Not only that. Upon further research it may be established that cows give more milk while watching "Father Knows Best," for instance, than they do watching "The Rifleman." What influence would this have on ratings?

The industry must face the future of television with stern resolve, and make what adjustments it can. There might even come a stage at which cows would have more to say about program ratings than vice presidents. If video should become a factor in serious overproduction of milk the departments of agriculture might step in. At that point the vice presidents might be willing to relinquish their positions.

An Unwarranted Misrepresentation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 1, 1961

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, after an uncalled for period of suppression, the truth about migratory labor conditions in the State of New Jersey has finally seen the light of day. This misrepresentation has been exposed by evidence submitted to a conference in Glassboro, N.J., a conference attended by representatives of various Federal, State, and private agencies concerned with migratory labor.

It is no credit to this legislative body that a subcommittee of the House Labor Committee accepted and published inaccurate and damaging testimony regarding migratory labor conditions in New Jersey without ever affording the opportunity to reply to the operators of the labor-pool service involved.

Nor is it to the credit of those in the television industry for releasing a study of the subject which was an equally unfortunate distortion of conditions as they actually exist. Members of the New Jersey Farm Bureau vigorously protested against this. Not that the effects of this misrepresentation have been confined to this country alone. Abroad, both the television film and the committee hearings containing the biased testimony have injured the prestige of the United States without just cause.

There is no secret in the fact that there is room for improvement in migrant labor standards, in New Jersey as well as elsewhere. But it seems only elementary fairness to call attention to progress that has been made, and to allow the presentation of facts to rebut the damaging testimony of a single witness.

I call the attention of the House, and of those throughout the country and the world who have been exposed to this irresponsible misrepresentation, to the true facts as succinctly summarized in an editorial published in the northern New Jersey newspaper, the Record, of July 29, 1961.

WHEN TRUTH PULLS ON ITS RUNNING SHOES

It's downright depressing to hear a committee of the Congress accused of practicing yellow journalism. But this is the overwhelming evidence of witnesses whose competence and disinterestedness are clear: a subcommittee of the House Labor Committee accepted and published damaging testimony on conditions in New Jersey migrant labor camps and then not only made no effort to check it but refused to hear a legitimate reply to it.

A migrant laborer named Fermin Lopez Romano testified he was paid 11 cents an hour. He testified he was beaten by a camp guard. The story made page 1. The operators of the labor-pool service asked the chairman of the subcommittee for a chance to comment. They got no reply. At a conference in Glassboro the other day they managed to get their evidence into the record: Mr. Lopez was paid the going rate, 80 cents; he had run up debts and medical-insurance

charges, however, which reduced his net earnings from \$142.18 to \$23.52; he was indeed struck by a guard, in self-defense during a fight. At the conference were the Commissioner of Labor and Industry, the State Secretary of Agriculture, officials of the Federal Department of Agriculture and the Consumers and Urban Leagues, representatives of Puerto Rican civic and social groups, and Roman Catholic and Protestant clergymen assigned to migrant laborers. The consensus was that, although there's room for improvement (cf. that 80-cent hourly pay), New Jersey maintains the highest migrant-labor standards in the Nation and that the House committee's dissemination of the unsupported Lopez testimony was unfortunate. Now let's see whether that truth can overhaul the scandalous misrepresentation.

Jersey Led the Way

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 1, 1961

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, President Kennedy has called on every American and particularly our youth to stress physical fitness. I am pleased that a constituent of mine, Carlos Diaz, of Bayonne, won the physical fitness test sponsored by the U.S. Marine Corps. Carlos was the top scorer with a performance record of 554 points out of a possible 600. Carlos competed with over 100,000 students throughout the country.

Everyone is indeed proud of Carlos, his family, community, State, and country, and I joint in congratulating this fine young man. I would like to include as part of my remarks the excellent editorial from the Jersey Journal of July 26, 1961:

JERSEY LED THE WAY

As everyone who ever answered a 6 a.m. military muster will tell you, the U.S. Marine Corps' legendary obsession with physical fitness has paid off handsomely on battlefields from Montezuma to the Chosin Reservoir.

When President Kennedy recently voiced open dismay about the physical condition of America's youth, the traditionally prepared Corps was equal to the occasion. The Marine Commandant, Gen. David M. Shoup, has ordered nationwide use of the physical fitness test pioneered right here in the last 2 years.

The test, administered to more than 100,000 students each year, was the brain child of Maj. John J. Swords, who commanded the metropolitan recruiters until his transfer this month to the Naval War College.

A decorated combat veteran, Major Swords reflected the corps' concern with the flabby physiques of today's recruits. His solution is typical of the resourcefulness of marine junior officers.

The success of Swords' excellent program soon was reported to the commandant, General Shoup, a Medal of Honor winner who belongs to the "hard belly" school of thinking, ordered the program expanded to reach the rest of this Nation's youth.

Carlos Diaz of Bayonne has already provided his fellow teenagers with a performance record to shoot for. His 554 points out of 600 made him top scorer this year and earned him a trip to the White House. Diaz' hand-

shake must have partially restored the President's confidence in the coming generation's brawn. The Marine Corps expanded fitness test should broaden that confidence even further.

New Figures on Russian Growth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 1, 1961

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, one of the subjects foremost in the minds of the American people is that of the Soviet economy and its comparisons with that of the United States. Hearings on this matter were held during the last Congress by the Joint Economic Committee and prominent mention was made of the threat of the Soviet economic gains in the 1960 election campaign.

Further information on the Soviet economy, new figures on the present rate of growth and indications of falsified statistics in previous periods, was reported in the July 24 issue of the New York Times. I believe that this information is very important and that these new figures on Russian growth should have wide dissemination among the American people who have such a deep interest in the subject matter.

I should like to place the New York Times article in the RECORD under previous permission:

SOVIET TIGHTENS OUTPUT CONTROLS—BOARDS ESTABLISHED TO BAR FALSE ECONOMIC REPORTS—GROWTH RATE SLOWS

Moscow, July 23.—The Soviet Union established today control commissions with extraordinary powers to deal with false economic reporting by managers in agriculture and industry.

The Government ordered the commissions set up on the national level and in the 15 republics. Last year a series of scandals implicated officials who had falsely claimed the fulfillment of economic goals.

The reorganization of the control bodies was put into effect in conjunction with a tightening of Communist Party supervision on every facet of economic activity.

The decree, which was published in Pravda, the Communist Party newspaper, creates commissions of state control.

The senior commission is under Premier Khrushchev and the subordinate commissions will function directly under the Councils of Ministers of the Republics.

The commissions will replace control departments that have operated with limited powers since August 1957, when their role in running the economy was deemphasized.

An official Soviet source said the commissions would have the right to inspect and to intervene in the activities of all economic organizations, including those on the ministerial level.

The drastic nature of the decree pointed up the fundamental difficulties of Soviet planners in obtaining honest data so correct economic projections can be made.

The decree said the commissions would be charged with rooting out and eliminating the padding and falsification of state accounts. They also are to deal with the tendency of officials to display favoritism toward their own localities or institutions.

The commissions will exercise control over the expenditure of state funds, the procurement of materials and the fulfillment of state production plans.

Writing in Pravda, the secretary of the Ukrainian Communist Party, Ivan P. Kazanets, gave two examples in his own Republic of abuses that should be corrected by the control commissions.

EXAMPLES ARE CITED

He cited the case of one regional economic council that had purchased automobiles with money assigned to it for building a factory. Another economic council allocated metal supplies that permitted its own enterprises to fulfill its production quota by 114 percent while another region was given a short supply so it could produce only 91 percent of its quota.

The most serious examples of fraudulent reporting of economic data were disclosed last winter and spring in agriculture. A wave of dismissals of officials followed the investigation launched by Premier Khrushchev on serious crop failures.

The entire top leadership of the Republic of Tadzhikistan was discharged for having falsified figures on the extent of cotton production.

It was noted here by Western experts that the state reports on the fulfillment of the national economic plan for the first 6 months of this year claimed an increase in industrial production of only 8.4 percent. This figure compares with an average of 11 percent for the like period in recent years.

There was speculation that the smaller figure might have reflected in part more honest reporting by economic managers after the campaign earlier this year against false reporting.

The figure of 8.4 percent still represents about twice the rate of economic growth of the United States.

SOVIET GROWTH SLOWS

Soviet economic growth is slowing appreciably. This is shown in the official data for the first half of this year published in Moscow last week.

Nevertheless, the U.S. Margin of superiority over the Soviet Union in industrial production was narrowed during the first 6 months of 1961. In this period Soviet industrial output grew 8.4 percent over the like period of 1960, while production in the United States declined because of the recession.

The trends in the two countries were shown clearly in steel production. Soviet steel output was less than 70 percent of that of the United States in the first half of 1960, but rose to about 85 percent of the American figure during the corresponding period this year. Soviet steel production continued to rise, while U.S. steel mills cut their output.

The rapid decline in the Soviet Union's economic growth rate in recent years throws a shadow over Premier Khrushchev's boast that the Soviet Union will overtake the United States in production by or before 1970.

Evidence that the Soviet Union is finding it increasingly difficult to maintain past high rates of production growth is abundant in the new official economic report.

A sharp decline was noted, for example, in the rate of growth of industrial labor's productivity. This year's figure is 3.5 percent, last year's was 6.4 percent, and 8 percent was claimed for 1959.

The Soviet report attributes this to the institution of a shorter workweek in factories and offices. However, about 20 million workers had been shifted to a shorter workweek a year ago.

Retail sales increased only 3.5 percent during the first half of this year. A 9-percent gain was claimed for 1960 and 1959.

Soviet foreign trade increased this year by only 2 percent. Last year a 6-percent

gain was claimed and a 20-percent increase was announced in 1959.

Some Soviet economic indicators declined during the first half of this year compared with the like period last year. New housing financed by the Soviet Government and finished during the first 6 months of 1961 was less than the corresponding figure last year. The amount of meat available for consumers also was down.

Some signs of inflationary pressures in the Soviet economy are also indicated in the report. Wages are said to have increased by 4 percent.

Key production figures released in the report for the first half of this year include the following: Pig iron, 25 million metric tons; steel, 34,800,000 metric tons; oil, 79,800,000 metric tons; and gas, 28,900 million cubic meters.

In connection with yesterday's Soviet decree tightening control over the economy, it was recalled that Premier Khrushchev demanded last January that punishment must be meted out to all persons guilty of falsifying production reports to the state. He said then:

"Unless we put things in order, the plans will be met statistically, but there won't be enough produce. As everyone knows, you can't make pancakes out of statistics."

Private Enterprise Has Much To Contribute to Exploration of Space

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 1, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, on many issues I find myself in opposition to the policies advocated by the administration. This is not because I see a partisan issue in every action, but rather because I have very firm convictions concerning the role of the Federal Government in the lives of the people. Very often, I find administration proposals running contrary to those convictions and I do not hesitate to speak out in opposition to plans for further Federal control, bigger welfare and spending programs, and politics as usual in the face of the critical situation in which the world finds itself. I hope I can be equally as frank when the administration advocates a policy which is sound and in keeping with our traditional concept of the free competitive system upon which our present greatness is built. Therefore, I applaud the administration for giving to private industry the opportunity to develop a communications satellite in outer space and echo the sentiments expressed in the following editorial from today's Wall Street Journal:

ENTERPRISE IN THE SKY

At first glance it would seem that one new frontier with little attraction for private industry would be the outer reaches of space. The rewards for exploring it appear to be more military and scientific than economic.

Yet that is not quite the case. It is already clear enough that, in the area of communications, space has its commercial uses; so much so that a good many private companies are willing to invest large sums of money in manufacturing satellites and installing them

in the sky. Several groups have made concrete proposals to the Government, and now President Kennedy has given them a favorable reception.

We find all this encouraging on two counts. First it speaks well of the enterprise of the companies involved; they show considerable imagination in seeing the practical possibilities of communications satellites and dilligence in tackling, well in advance, the problems of technology and cost accounting.

Equally encouraging is the attitude of the administration toward the future of private industry in space. Mr. Kennedy has laid down some very sensible guides—the final plans, for example, must safeguard against a private monopoly in this field of communication and permit participation by foreign as well as American industry in the enterprise. But he has definitely rejected the arguments that space must be, altogether, a Government monopoly.

An immediate gain from this is that private risk capital, not the taxpayer's funds, will bear the cost of establishing a usable communications system through satellites. The interested companies—including such established firms as A.T. & T., General Electric and RCA—are confident they can raise the \$200 million to \$300 million necessary to launch a space relay system. As a byproduct, of course, private capital will also be paying a part of the cost of advancing space technology.

But the long-range gain from the President's ruling will be more important. For it opens wide the doors to space, heretofore a Government domain. And no man can foresee what fertile fields may be found when men are free to make peaceful enterprise in the sky.

Answer to Washington Post's Hanford Editorial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 1, 1961

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, I have sent the following letter to the editor of the Washington Post commenting on that newspaper's editorial urging expenditure of \$95 million of the people's money to add electric generating facilities to the new plutonium production reactor at Hanford, Wash.:

JULY 31, 1961.

EDITOR: Like Pavlov's reflex conditioned dogs, the Post compulsively refuses to permit facts to interfere with its editorial opinions when public power is at stake. Result: Monday's plug for \$95 million from the public till to generate electricity at the AEC's new plutonium reactor at Hanford, Wash.

True, as editorially stated, public power is at issue. But only because its opportunistic adherents are using spurious arguments of all kinds in their efforts to slip it in through the Hanford back door.

Untrue, as editorially misstated, that the reactor "will necessarily generate steam." It will produce heat as a byproduct. Issue: can this byproduct be turned into steam, then into kilowatts, then sold to recover the \$95 million investment? Even a series of economic studies based on unrealistically hopeful assumptions produced no more than a classically "lffy" response to the question.

Untrue, as editorially misstated, that the proposed "biggest nuclear powerplant in the

world" would constitute "an advertisement of this country's determination to use atoms for peace." Rather, to a world gaging technical achievement by quality rather than quantity, this plan incorporating steam temperature, pressure, and quality close to Fulton's steamboat than to modern technology would advertise something else: the extent to which the United States will suffer technological retrogression to give the public power lobby its way.

Untrue, as editorially inferred, that the project is the sole answer to an alleged "desperate need of additional power" to assure the Northwest's growth. In the midsixties a 1- or 2-year period is anticipated when power supplies will be tight, but the situation will be solved by the new treaty with Canada. Meanwhile, any day public power zealots relax their grip on the Northwest, private power groups stand ready, willing, and able to supply all needed power at fair, publicly regulated rates.

Untrue, as editorially misstated, that the proposal is "warmly endorsed by the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy." The fact is that only a simple majority of the committee's members support it, while a strong minority oppose it. This minority not only succeeded in convincing the House of the unwisdom of the Post's editorial position, but points to a truly beneficial public purpose for which the \$95 million can be spent. Namely, to let the Nation's nuclear power industry get off dead center. In the process install several million kilowatts of technically advanced, taxpaying nuclear generating facilities, and thereby advertise something really creditable to the world.

CRAIG HOSMER,

Member of Congress, California.

Spiritual National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 1, 1961

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the Lions Club of Bamberg, S.C., has recently had printed a statement by Dr. James P. Carroll, pastor of the First Baptist Church of Bamberg, S.C., on the subject of "Spiritual National Defense." I have had an opportunity to read this splendid statement, which is directed principally against the menace of world communism. I feel that it definitely makes a contribution to our national security and that it merits reprinting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I, therefore, ask unanimous consent that Dr. Carroll's statement, together with the foreword by Mr. B. Monroe Hiers, president of the Bamberg Lions Club, be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOREWORD

Sir Edmund Burke, the great English statesman and orator, said: "All that is necessary for the forces of evil to win is for enough good men to do nothing."

The Bamberg Lions Club is in hearty agreement with that statement and this little booklet is presented as a definite contribution against the forces of evil as represented by communism in our country today.

We are proud of the fact that the author of this pamphlet, Dr. James P. Carroll is a member of our club. As pastor of the First Baptist Church of Bamberg, S.C., he has contributed 18 years of loyal service to his church, our community and our Nation.

If you are not already numbered among those who are aggressively fighting the evil of communism we remind you that it is later than you think and we sincerely hope that this booklet will be the means of placing you among the number who are willing to stand up and be counted as dedicated foes of the Communist way of life.

B. MONROE HIERS,

President, Bamberg Lions Club.

SPIRITUAL NATIONAL DEFENSE

(By Lion James P. Carroll, D.D.)

When most of us think of national defense, we think in terms of guns, ships, submarines, missiles, armed men, and the other things which are necessary for military conflict. Of course, such military defenses are vital to the security of our country, and all of us fervently hope that ours are adequate. What we need to realize is that military defense is not the only kind needed, nor is it the most important. Because of the character of the enemy we face; because of the methods the enemy employs, and because of the alarming success the enemy is having, we need also what we are calling Spiritual National Defense. By spiritual defense, we do not mean simply religion, as such, though, of course, that is of tremendous importance. We mean rather a revitalizing of those ways of thought and life, those purposes, loyalties, and ideals which have made our country great, and which are now in jeopardy. In fact, we are prepared to say that unless there is this type of defense, all of our military defense will be of no avail, and our country, as we know and love it, will one day be no more.

THE ENEMY WE FACE

Let us consider first, the enemy we face. There is no doubt that the enemy is communism. Communism is an ideology, a philosophy, a way of life which is totally at variance with democracy, and Christianity, and civilization as we know them. It appears in many places and in many forms, but it is always basically the same in belief and purpose, whether it is in Soviet Russia, Red China, strife-torn Cuba, or the United States. Communism is many things. It is atheism; one of its basic tenets being that there is no God. It is materialism, setting up things as being the chief values of life and denying the spiritual. It is collectivism, abolishing the right of private ownership. It is statism, giving the government absolute control over the life of the individual. It is anarchy, boldly advocating the overthrow of all other ways of life. It is dictatorship, which while talking of brotherhood, oppresses people under an iron heel. The writings of the Communists themselves show this description of them to be true. One of Lenin's classic statements was that "religion is the opiate of the people." That is to say, religion dulls the sensibilities of people, and makes them blind to the realities of their own needs and possibilities. Therefore, there is no place for religion in communism. Another of their spokesmen said in 1950, "The struggle against the Gospel and the Christian legend must be conducted ruthlessly and with all the means at the disposal of the Communists." Communism itself becomes the religion of the people, with their own leaders elevated to the place of God. While Stalin was living, these words of praise were written. "Father. What could be nearer and dearer than that name? 'Soviet people one and all call Stalin 'Our Father.' For like a loving, tender father, like a wise mentor and teacher, Stalin brings up the new generation of people, builders of communism." It is no wonder that the first thing the Communists

do when they come in is to destroy the Bible, silence the preachers, and close the churches, because communism denies everything the Bible teaches. According to communism, there is no God; man has no soul; there is no hereafter; a man's life is of no value; a person should own no property; one should have no home of his own; children do not belong to parents but to the government; there are no moral laws. Communism says that not love and kindness but force, power, cruelty, deceit, and extermination are supreme.

Communism says that there is no such thing as truth. There is only expediency. Again to quote Lenin, "Words have no relation to action. Words are one thing, actions are another. Good words are a mask for the concealment of evil deeds." Khrushchev says, "You should not take too seriously the treaties made with imperialists. Lenin, too, signed a peace treaty after World War I that remained valid only so long as it proved necessary." In other words, treaties are to be honored only so long as they serve the interests of the Communists. That is the reason successful negotiations cannot be carried on with the Communists. How can you negotiate with people who do not recognize the distinction between truth and falsehood? The Communists say one thing and do another. They talk peace and promote war. They use smiles to veil their evil intentions. They extend a hand of friendship, and when it is grasped, it becomes a mailed fist. A study has been made of nearly one thousand treaties and agreements which Russia has made with other countries which shows that she has broken her word to almost every country with which she has agreed. In broken treaties, she holds the record among all civilized countries of the world since the beginning of recorded history. Since people belong to the state, they may be slaughtered, imprisoned, reduced to slavery without even a second thought. John Noble in his book, "I Was a Slave in Russia," estimates that there are 28 million people in slave labor camps in Russia. When Khrushchev was boss of the rich Ukraine, he wanted to destroy private ownership, and collectivize the farms. When he met opposition, he simply produced a man-made famine and starved between 8 and 12 million people into submission. No one, of course, knows, with accuracy, but it is reliably estimated that in Russia 20 million people have been "liquidated," and that in China 30 million people have been murdered. This, then is the enemy we face—cold, cruel, crafty, ruthless, godless communism.

THE GOAL OF COMMUNISM

Shall we look, in the second place, at the enemy's purpose? According to their own spokesmen, it is nothing short of world domination. It was avowed in the very beginning, and it has never been changed or retracted. The Communist Manifesto declared that they would overthrow all existing social conditions. Again, to quote Khrushchev "If any one thinks our smiles mean the abandonment of the teachings of Marx, Engels, and Lenin he is deceiving himself cruelly." And what are those teachings? Total warfare—political, economic, psychological, diplomatic, military, if necessary, global until there is complete world domination. The threatening words of Khrushchev still ominously echo in our ears. "Whether you like it or not, history is on our side. We will bury you." Thirty-five years ago, a three-point program or timetable was adopted by the Communists. First, they would take Eastern Europe. Second, they would take the masses of Asia. Third, they would take the rest of the world, including the United States. Some say that they have now achieved almost two-thirds of

their goal. It scares us, doesn't it? Certainly, they are well along on the way, running about on schedule.

THE STRATEGY OF THE COMMUNISTS

Shall we consider now the strategy of the enemy? How do they go about accomplishing their purposes? They will engage in war if necessary, but they will win without war if possible. Khrushchev has declared that communism will prevail without a major war. Let us remember that communism is an ideology, a set of ideas, and when those ideas have prevailed communism will have won, as the Russians say, very probably, without a war. Every means is employed by the Communists to spread their propaganda. A skillful machine works steadily around the clock. They have schools for the training of people whose job it is infiltrate every phase of our society and sow the seeds of communism. They make their way into industry, labor, education, and yes, even religion itself. Communism never identifies itself as such. Rather it says, "I am simply here to show you a better way." Communist agents, cells, spies are everywhere. Their strategy is not so much to attack from without as to destroy from within. Like termites, they bore away unseen at the foundations of the structure of our institutions until they simply collapse. They work unseen, but with great effectiveness. Constantly the battle of minds, ideas and ideals is waged.

IS COMMUNISM MAKING PROGRESS?

Let us now ask how the enemy is making out. Have they made any progress? This question has already been partially answered, but let us pursue it further. When Karl Marx died 75 years ago, only 8 people attended his funeral. Fifteen years ago, there were 4½ million Communists in the world, holding in subjection 180 million people, about one-fourteenth of the population of the world. Today there are 33 million adherents to communism who have enslaved 900 million people, about 40 percent of the world's population. They control about one-fourth of the land mass of the world. Now of these 33 million adherents, only about 8 million are the trained, disciplined, hard core of communism. In Russia, not over 3 percent are Communists, but they rule with an iron fist. They are a frightening demonstration of the tremendous power that can be wielded by a trained and determined minority. For the 10 years following World War II, the Communists averaged adding 7,000 people every hour, 24 hours a day, 365 days a year. Since 1958, they have added 12,000 every hour, every day, every year. All of this without a major war. The question is often asked to what extent communism has infiltrated the United States. That, of course, is difficult to answer with accuracy. But people who have every reason to know, like J. Edgar Hoover, tell us that it is truly alarming. There is a strong Communist Party, but that is not the chief threat. It is the undercover, insidious, creeping paralysis kind of communism that we should fear most. There are disturbing reports of its influence in our labor organizations, our Government, our educational system, and even in our religious organizations. Not all who swallow the propaganda line do so deliberately. Communism is very subtle. It files false colors. It represents itself as being a good cause. It parades under high-sounding names. It speaks of such things as peace, brotherhood, equality of opportunity, understanding, the right to enjoy the good things of life. Many a well-intentioned, unsuspecting person has been "taken in," without realizing what he was getting into. We do not have to exaggerate the facts to show that the rapid spread of communism should be of vital concern to every American.

THE NEED FOR SPIRITUAL DEFENSE

All of these things—the character of the enemy, the subtle strategy of the enemy, the amazing success of the enemy sound an urgent call not only for military preparedness and defense, but also an intensive and effective spiritual defense. As we know, the best defense is offense. We need not only to attack the beliefs of the Communists, but we need also to be loyal to our own beliefs as Americans, and as Christians as never before. We must oppose error with truth. We must, if you please, use our own propaganda. We must intensify our efforts to teach the younger generation such things as the existence of God, the sacredness of personality, the supremacy of spiritual values, the reality of moral standards, the intrinsic worth of every individual, the value of ambition, the pride of individual ownership, the desirability of healthy competition, the dignity of honest labor, the validity of our democratic processes, the exalted place which the church should hold in our lives. In other words, we must start emphasizing the things we have always taken for granted. We must be positive in our loyalties to the things in which we have always believed. We must realize that half-empty churches, unread Bibles, and worshipless Sundays pave the road for communism. A great English statesman said, "All that is necessary for evil to prosper is for good men to do nothing." We may be careless and indifferent and lackadaisical about Christianity and democracy if we want to, but let us not forget that the Communists are at work ceaselessly around the clock. In other words, we must not just be against communism. We must be for freedom. Also, we need to be on guard against those attitudes in ourselves and in others which "soften us up," and make us ripe for the inroads of communism. By that we mean such things as feeling that "the world owes me a living", the feeling that "the Government ought to supply all of our needs", the feeling that "that is of no concern to me, let somebody else do it," the feeling of "why should I work? I'll just draw my pension and social security." We need to guard against the loss of individual enterprise; the centralization of great power in the hands of a few; the creation of more and more agencies and bureaus. We need to be careful that we do not lose our ability to think for ourselves, to reach our own conclusions, to formulate our own actions. When we do, we make ourselves vulnerable to the infiltration of communism.

CHARACTER IS THE BEST DEFENSE

Around the ancient Kingdom of China, there was a great wall. In those days, it was impregnable. The enemy could not scale it or dig through it. It would seem then that the kingdom was secure, but not so. History shows that the enemy made several invasions. They did not destroy the great wall. They simply bribed the gatekeepers who opened the gates and let them in. It is the character of a people which determines the strength of their defenses. It is not our military might alone which will determine our defeat or our victory. Let us remember how communism has spread without firing a shot. It may be the story of the Great Wall of China all over again. In the final analysis, we shall stand or fall on the basis of what we believe, what we live, what we are willing to die for.

WE ARE AT WAR WITH COMMUNISM NOW

Some expert students of communism have recently written a book called "Protracted Conflict." It declares that world war III has already begun, and that we are in the midst of it right now. It gives the Communist master plan for world conquest. Consider these words from the book: "Whether the American people can muster

the requisite determination and preparedness will depend upon their recognition of the basic facts of the world today. We are in the midst of a world revolution. It will end only in total victory or total defeat. The fact that bombs are not falling must not blind us to this crucial reality. The great hope, and as yet, it is only a hope, is that we will rally for effective defense and for a bold counteroffensive before it is too late. Already the enemy has had a leadtime of 40 years in training professionals in the arts and sciences of nonmilitary warfare. Isn't it about time we did likewise?"

THE URGENCY OF THE HOUR

As we think of the urgency of spiritual national defense, these words of Josiah Gilbert Holland express our need:

"God, give us men.

A time like this demands strong minds,
great hearts,

True faith and ready hands.

Men whom the lust of office does not kill;

Men whom the spoils of office cannot buy;

Men who possess opinions and a will;

Men who have honor; men who will not lie;

Men who can stand before a demagog

And damn his treacherous flattery without
winking;

Tall men, sun-crowned, who live above the
fog.

In public duty and in private thinking.

For while the rabble, with their thumb-
worn creeds,

Their large professions and their little
deeds,

Mingle in selfish strife,

Lo, freedom weeps, wrong rules the land,
And waiting justice weeps."

Tenth Anniversary of American College of Foot Orthopedists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 1, 1961

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, August marks the 10th anniversary of the American College of Foot Orthopedists. I am pleased that Dr. Robert Schleider, of my constituency, is president of the eastern division of the American College of Foot Orthopedists.

I would like to call the following article to the attention of my colleagues in commemoration of this anniversary:

TENTH ANNIVERSARY AMERICAN COLLEGE OF
FOOT ORTHOPEDISTS

August 1961 marks the 10th Anniversary of the American College of Foot Orthopedists. The American College of Foot Orthopedists is that specialty of the healing arts whose fellows devote the major part of their practice to foot orthopedics with official recognition and sanction as specialists in this branch of medicine.

The primary ideals of this group is to promote greater understanding of the specialty of foot orthopedics; to maintain the highest standards in treatment; to continue research in this field and to educate the public of the importance of orthopedic care as a vital health measure.

In achieving its objectives, the American College of Foot Orthopedists is presently engaged in the following projects:

1. Fostering research in the study of edema in the foot and ankle and study of the osseous development of the child's foot.

2. Standardization of nomenclature.
3. Survey questionnaires and compilation of statistical data.

4. Preparation of bibliographies on orthopedics.

5. Preparation and revision of abstracts and summaries on outstanding scientific references.

6. Preparation and revision of instruction manuals for writing and presenting research reports.

7. National, divisional and State meetings for the purpose of exchanging ideas and promoting mutual understanding.

8. Of utmost concern is maintaining the highest qualifications in the field of orthopedics.

There is much to be accomplished in the future in order to meet the requirements of our ever-increasing population. We, as podiatrists, look forward to the continuance and expansion of the activities in the health field. We dedicate ourselves to continued cooperation with all health agencies, the Council on Youth Fitness and the Council on the Aged. The members of the ACFO will cooperate in every way with the American Podiatry Association's representatives to these councils, and in the field of foot health. We will endeavor to serve humanity to the best of our ability.

Administration Abandonment of Policy of Massive Retaliation Endangers the Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 1, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, now it is out in the open. Administration spokesmen are no longer hinting at the abandonment of the policy of massive retaliation in any war the Communists start, they are openly advocating it. At this point, I would like to include an article from the Wall Street Journal clearly pointing up the position of Gen. Maxwell Taylor, the President's most powerful military adviser, favoring a return to conventional combat in preparation for limited war and also an article from today's New York Times in which Chester Bowles, the Assistant Secretary of State, is quoted as disavowing the policy of massive retaliation as part of the administration program.

[From the Wall Street Journal]

WAR, LIMITED—GEN. MAXWELL TAYLOR'S VIEW
THAT UNITED STATES MUST BE READY FOR
CONVENTIONAL COMBAT IS INCREASINGLY
VALID

(By William Henry Chamberlin)

It is hardly coincidence that the military doctrine of preparedness for limited war without the use of nuclear weapons set forth in Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor's book, "The Uncertain Trumpet," is in close accordance with the purposes of the additional military expenditures advocated by President Kennedy. For Taylor, as the President's personal military adviser, has been wielding very considerable influence on White House military thinking.

Taylor is an uncommonly brilliant, magnetic and persuasive personality, with the double background of a glamorous combat

record in World War II plus an unusual range of intellectual interests.

He undertook a delicate and dangerous scouting mission behind the German lines in Rome and was one of the first officers of general rank to parachute into France in June 1944. He is an accomplished linguist, master of several European languages, with an excellent knowledge of Japanese and a fair knowledge of Chinese. He was an eager educational innovator when he was superintendent at West Point and during his 4-year term as Army Chief of Staff conceived some strong and definite ideas about American military policy which he set forth in a book after retiring from the service.

APPROPRIATE RESPONSE

Taylor's reemergence into a position which perhaps carries greater power and influence than he possessed as Army Chief of Staff (where he often felt frustrated by the combined opposition of the Navy and Air Force representatives) marks the eclipse of massive retaliation as the keynote of American defense policy. In its place has come the so-called policy of flexible response. As General Taylor writes in "The Uncertain Trumpet":

"The national military program of flexible response should contain at the outset an unqualified renunciation of reliance on the strategy of massive retaliation. It should be made clear that the United States will prepare itself to respond anywhere, any time, with weapons and forces appropriate to the situation including massive retaliation.

"There are still voices to assert the impossibility of having a limited war in the NATO area. Such an assertion means that any collision of patrols over, say, Berlin, would automatically result in general atomic war. It offers no alternative other than reciprocal suicide or retreat in the face of the superiority of Soviet conventional forces. Such talk does little to reassure our allies. Furthermore, it is nonsense. If men who are both sane and determined continue to direct nations, they will initially take all measures short of general war to resist aggression—regardless of the nationality of the aggressor."

General Taylor's thinking parallels rather closely that of a German-born Harvard professor, Henry A. Kissinger, who spends a good deal of time these days commuting between Cambridge, Mass., and Washington as a consultant to the President. Kissinger leaped into international fame in 1957 with the publication of a book, "Nuclear Weapons and Foreign Policy," maintaining the thesis that even a nuclear war could be kept limited by employing only smaller tactical weapons, not the biggest bombs, with their awesome blast and fallout potentialities. In this work, which was widely quoted on both sides of the Atlantic, Kissinger argued that the threat of all-out war "purchases deterrence at an exorbitant risk."

"It requires us," he continues, "in every crisis to stake our survival on the credibility of a threat which we will be increasingly reluctant to implement and which, if implemented, will force us into the kind of war our strategy should make every attempt to avoid."

The course of events in the last years, and especially the demonstrations of Soviet skill and power in rocketry, have lent support to the thinking of Taylor and Kissinger. As Soviet power to inflict devastation on the United States has become more visible there is less credibility in the idea of the United States resorting to thermonuclear weapons as the solution for a hassle over Berlin or as a reprisal for the infiltration of Communist guerrillas into South Vietnam or Thailand.

Yet there must be some response to such provocations, or there is a bleak and dreary prospect of the non-Communist world being

nibbled away or intimidated into submission by a series of adroit acts of aggression, no one of which will seem provocative enough to warrant resort to ultimate weapons. Here is where the doctrine of flexible response, provided the men, the training, and the tools are in adequate supply, seems to make more sense than the vague threat of a reaction so awesome and so grave in its possible consequences for America itself that it becomes less and less credible either to friend or to foe.

UNWRITTEN RESTRAINTS

If the United States is unlikely to try to obliterate Moscow and Leningrad if an American convoy is held up outside Berlin, the Soviet Union is equally unlikely to aim bombs at New York and Washington, if an American military guard brushes the obstruction aside. Both sides in the Korean war placed themselves under considerable unwritten restraints. It is possible that this decade of perilous brinkmanship will witness other conflicts waged with nonnuclear weapons.

Possible, but, of course, not certain. There is no umpire with power to insure that the ground rules of limited warfare will be observed. Neither Taylor nor Kissinger rules out the possible necessity of resorting to nuclear weapons, if the very existence of America is at stake. Neither does President Kennedy, as his sober reference to the desirability of fallout shelters proves.

But there is a clear tendency today, reinforced by the stalemate of mutual terror which has been created in the field of nuclear weapons, at least to experiment with limited warfare, which could even take economic or diplomatic, as well as military forms, to make the big bang of nuclear detonation the last, not the first resort.

[From the New York Times, Aug. 1, 1961]

BOWLES SAYS MASSIVE RETALIATION POLICY FADES—TELLS ENVOYS UNITED STATES DEPENDS ON NORMAL BUILDUP

(By Lawrence Fellows)

NICOSIA, CYPRUS, July 31.—Chester Bowles said today that the United States was trying to edge away from the policy of massive retaliation.

The Under Secretary of State made the remark in an hour-long address to U.S. diplomats who are stationed in 21 countries in North Africa and Middle East. They are meeting here.

The United States is relying more on building up its conventional strength on the ground, Mr. Bowles said.

At the same time, he added, the United States is putting more weight on the political approach in areas of sensitivity abroad.

IDEAS MOST POWERFUL

The feeling in the Kennedy administration, he said, is that the force of political ideas is far more powerful than the sum of military strength and national wealth of any country.

The policy of massive retaliation was enunciated by the late John Foster Dulles as Secretary of State. It meant an overwhelming attack by the United States in reply to military aggression.

In addition to moving away from this policy, Mr. Bowles said, the administration is trying to assert more leadership over those countries that are friendly to the United States but bring the Nation into embarrassing diplomatic situations.

He did not enlarge upon this statement in the meeting, which was closed to all but the diplomats. The speech was summarized afterward by Carl Rowan, Assistant Deputy Secretary of State for Public Affairs.

Mr. Rowan used a hypothetical example to explain.

"If the United States takes a position in favor of self-determination, it does not want a friendly nation to destroy it," he said. The

allusion could have been to the French in North Africa or the Portuguese in Angola. "Men have the God-given right to govern themselves," Mr. Rowan added.

AID POLICY EXPLAINED

In his talk to the diplomats, who will confer for 4 days, Mr. Bowles also said the administration wanted to make it clear that programs of assistance were not measures taken out of fear of communism.

The point Mr. Bowles made was that assistance was given because it was right to give it and not in an attempt to buy support.

The great advantage that lies with the United States in the fight for world opinion, Mr. Bowles added, is that it wants only to achieve for people what they want for themselves. The Soviet Union has the disadvantage of wanting to dictate to people how they should live, he declared.

Mr. Speaker, this Nation must not make a unilateral commitment disavowing the full use of nuclear power for massive retaliation in favor of General Taylor's flexible response. To do so commits us to a contest with the Communists in their own area, where they are strongest, and on their terms. This is the surest way to give Khrushchev the excuse he needs to push the world into war. We have kept the peace because of his fear of our massive retaliation and, in my opinion, this is the only policy which will give us the strength we need to prevent war, or to win it, if the Communists start it.

Limited war for the United States is not possible any longer—that is, if we hope to win victory over the Communists. We cannot match them in manpower and using our resources to put out the brushfires they start simply depletes our strength and endangers our position in the long run.

We are superior in nuclear power and we can maintain that superiority if we use defense funds for missile development and research. This is the policy of strength Khrushchev will understand and which will keep him in line in Berlin and other parts of the world where he plans to divert our attention and our strength.

For the sake of all those who will be called upon to fight, for the sake of the millions who will die at the hands of the marching Communist hordes, in behalf of the freedom of this Nation and the liberty of all mankind, I implore the administration not to weaken us further by exhausting our defense dollars in a buildup of conventional weapons, obsolete ships and aircraft, and manpower, but rather speed up research and development of modern weapons and modern power of warfare which will blast Moscow from the face of the earth should the Communist dictator be so foolish as to plunge the world into the horror of war.

The danger is too great that limited war will not stay limited but will expand to nuclear, either with smaller tactical weapons or then the largest weapons. Therefore, no war must be permitted to begin or even be contemplated as so-called limited. [The next war God forbid, will be nuclear.] We must not let it start in the guise of a limited engagement that then expands.

In short our only hope for peace is the continued threat of massive nuclear retaliation against any aggression. Under no circumstances must we unilaterally commit ourselves to refrain from massive retaliation because this ties one hand behind us, and invites a limited war, which might never have started except for our implied suggestion that we would not use nuclear weapons.

United States Should Protect Interest in Soviet Airline Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 1, 1961

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, several weeks ago a group of our colleagues engaged in a most interesting colloquy concerning international air competition, and the manner in which the odds seem overwhelmingly against our American-flag airlines.

Now our carriers are about to get a real challenge—from Aeroflot, the Soviet airline owned by the Kremlin and operated by the Red Air Force. Negotiations between the Soviet Government and our State Department are now in progress.

I have before me a new warning as to what our country faces in the form of subsidized government-owned competitors. As useful and informative as the discussion by our colleagues was, Mr. Speaker, an editorial in a recent edition of the San Diego Evening Tribune is just as illuminating.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend and revise my remarks, I include an editorial from the San Diego Evening Tribune entitled "United States Should Protect Interest in Soviet Airline Conference" in the RECORD:

UNITED STATES SHOULD PROTECT INTEREST IN SOVIET AIRLINE CONFERENCE

The United States had better have its guard up and its eyes open in the negotiations now underway with the Soviet Union over a commercial air treaty between the two countries.

This issue is loaded—heavily in the Russians' favor.

The reason is simple. Pan American World Airways, one of the two airlines involved, is a free enterprise American corporation. Aeroflot, the Soviet entry, is part of the Russian Government—actually, a part of the Red air force.

Besides having to operate efficiently and safely in the interest of the traveling public, Pan American has to operate profitably, in the interest of its 40,000 public stockholders.

It has to satisfy banking and insurance company creditors who have advanced the company hundreds of millions of dollars to finance its jet fleet.

Aeroflot has no more need to show a profit than has one of Premier Khrushchev's jet bombers.

Costs widen the gap in true competition. Pan American has to pay about \$6 million for a jet airplane.

The price of a Soviet TU-114, or any other aircraft which Aeroflot might use on a route

to the United States, is meaningless. Labor and materials costs in the Soviet Union can't be estimated in terms of dollars, since these items bear no relationship to American costs.

Some Pan American pilots can make as much as \$30,000 a year. An Aeroflot pilot is paid the equivalent of \$8,400 a year—less than a third as much. The same disparity in wages probably exists throughout Aeroflot's personnel.

Wholly government-owned, and with no need to show a profit, the Russian airline could operate in a manner that its American free enterprise competitor couldn't match and stay in business for long.

It could offer service far in excess of need, disregarding losses which simply would be absorbed by the Government.

If the American counterpart were forced into this uneconomic competition, the results could be disastrous to the financial soundness of the airline and to the savings its stockholders have invested in it.

American-flag airlines flying the North Atlantic already have complained to the Civil Aeronautics Board that KLM, the Netherlands airline, and SAS, the Scandinavian airline, are offering passenger and cargo service in excess of requirements.

Competition with subsidized, low-pay, foreign airlines is an old story for Pan American, which has done a good job in holding its own. But the Russian challenge is more serious.

The U.S. Government representatives in the current negotiations—at which Pan American is only an observer—should make certain that American interests, both private and national, are safeguarded.

Declaration of Independence for 1961

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. ROUSSELOT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 1, 1961

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, a considerable portion of our Nation's citizenry is deeply disturbed by the speed with which the Federal Government is usurping individual and States rights. Opposition to Federal assumption of activities historically carried out by State and local governments and by private enterprise is mounting faster than the collectivists or Socialists in this country would like to believe.

On June 30, 1961, the Holbrook Tribune-News, a newspaper published in Holbrook, Navajo County, Ariz., published a "Declaration of Independence for 1961 A.D." The declaration reiterates those principles of free government and individual responsibility which underlie the original Declaration of Independence and which are no less applicable today.

Under leave granted, I include the "Declaration of Independence for 1961 A.D." in the Appendix of the RECORD:

DECLARATIONS OF INDEPENDENCE FOR 1961 A.D.

"The true danger is when liberty is nibbled away, for expedients and by parts."

—EDMUND BURKE.

In the years 1957, 1958, and 1959, this newspaper published a modern declaration of independence fitting the times. If the original, authored by Thomas Jefferson, was

a great document—as the entire world acclaims—then the circumstances that forced citizens in the New World to separate from the mother government should be as compelling today as then.

Evils complained of in 1776 were either valid or imaginary, and if valid, their character has not changed in the intervening years. Because of apathy and enjoyment of abundance by the great majority of Americans, there is a grave danger American liberty is disappearing; that the ultimate result of recent trends will be on overgrown, arrogant, dictatorial bureaucracy that demands more and ever more taxes to support bureaucratic tyrants, originally supposed to be servants of the people.

Believing with Daniel Webster that "Nothing will ruin the country if the people, themselves, will undertake its safety; and nothing can save it if they leave that safety in any hands but their own," it is deemed appropriate, again, to use Jefferson's original as a guide in reasserting the fundamental principles upon which the American Government was established.

This editor hopes that the great basic truths spoken by one of America's greatest patriots, Patrick Henry, that "No free government or the blessings of liberty, can be preserved to any people but by a firm adherence to justice, temperance, frugality, and virtue, and by a frequent recurrence to fundamental principles," makes it timely—especially in the year 1961—to point out the dangers of gradual encroachments upon individual liberty by our present highly centralized Federal Government.

A restatement of the basic rights of individual American citizens, with a list of the more important of their grievances, may cause responsible people to reexamine what is happening to their liberties.

Inasmuch as history has shown that the natural results in government, of whatever form, is tyranny, it may be beneficial to remind those who represent us in our Government of Cicero's admonition that "The administration of government, like a guardianship, ought to be directed to the good of those who confer, not of those who receive the trust."

With these hopes in mind, following is this editor's "Declaration of Independence for 1961 A.D.":

We proclaim anew that men are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

We reassert the self-evident truth that all men are created equal before the law; that the U.S. Government, and its agencies, have been instituted to provide this equality and freedom under the Constitution of the United States of America, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed.

We declare that whenever any form of government becomes destructive to these ends, it is the right of the people to alter it. Prudence, indeed, will dictate that governments long established should not be changed for light and transient causes; and accordingly, all experience has shown that mankind are more disposed to suffer, while evils are sufferable, than to right themselves by abolishing the forms to which they have become accustomed.

But when a long train of abuses and usurpations, pursuing inevitably the same object, evinces a design to reduce them under absolute bureaucracy, it is their right, it is their duty, to throw off such government, and provide new guards for their future security.

Such has been the patient sufferance of American citizens; and such is now the necessity which constrains them to list their grievances of repeated oppressions and usurpations by a bureaucratic government.

Firm in the belief that a frequent recurrence to fundamental principles is essential to the security and perpetuity of a free government, we, the people of the United States, in order to retain a more perfect union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquility, provide for the common defense, and promote the general welfare, to secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and posterity, do recite the evils that beset us, and reaffirm the basic principles of American freedom and justice.

Our Government has created and erected a multitude of new offices, which have adopted endless rules and regulations, having the force of statutory law, but without the sanction of the people, and sent forth swarms of officers to harass the people, and eat out their substance with unbearable taxes.

It has inaugurated, and continued, a program of gratuities to foreign, and in many cases, alien nations under a guise of improving commerce and friendship, neither of which have been forthcoming, and such gratuities, together with the compensation of the Army of military and civilian staffs dispensing such gratuities, have resulted in burdensome and unconscionable taxes.

It has affected to render the military independent of, and superior to, the civil power.

It has combined with others to subject us to jurisdictions foreign to our Constitution, and unacknowledged by our laws.

It has imposed grievous taxes in the forms of fees, licenses, and stamps on us, without our consent.

It has abrogated the Bill of Rights substituting therefor arbitrary rules and regulations of a multitude of its agencies, changing the relations as between sovereign States, upsetting traditional laws of the same sovereign States as to relations to one another, and created and perpetuated fictions of the wildest imagination to entrench itself in power over State legislatures and the people.

We, as citizens of a blessed land, appealing to the aspirations and hopes of all good men, in the name and authority of the people of the United States, set forth in all seriousness, candor, and good intent, the following principles:

No person shall be subject for the same offense to be twice put in jeopardy of life, or limb, nor be deprived of life, liberty, or property without due process of law, nor shall private property be taken for public use without just compensation for values established by his peers. Such public use of property may not be to satisfy the whim or fancy of some subordinate Federal agency, bureau, commission, or official, but shall be established beyond reasonable doubt to be in the interest of the welfare of all the people.

No person shall be compelled to perform the duties of any Federal agency, including the collection of taxes, fees, duties, and licenses, without just compensation for the services required, nor be punished for declining such services whether compensation is made or not.

In all criminal prosecutions, arising out of, or because of, violations of rules and regulations promulgated by the agencies of the Federal Government (which neither the Congress nor the people have enacted in the usual legislative process), the accused shall enjoy the right to a speedy and public trial, by an impartial jury of his peers in the state and district wherein the violation shall have been committed, and to be informed of the nature and cause of the accusation; to be confronted with the witnesses against him; to have compulsory process for obtaining witnesses in his favor, and to have the assistance of counsel for his defense.

All political power is inherent in the people, and the Government derives its just powers from the consent of the governed, and has been established to protect and maintain individual rights as opposed to bureaucratic rights. The enumeration in the Constitution of certain rights shall not be construed to deny nor disparage others retained by the people; the powers not delegated to the Government by the Constitution, nor prohibited to it by the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people.

No fiction as to the general welfare shall be employed by any branch or department of the Government to impose laws, regulations, or rules of doubtful application to legalize the desires, objectives, or programs of the Federal Government, or its agencies, bureaus, commissions, or officials.

Programs or projects designed for the general benefit or interests of the people shall be inaugurated and carried out by the National Government only upon petition of those so to benefit, and shall not be planned, authorized, inaugurated, nor promulgated by any Federal agency except upon specific direction of the people as expressed by petition or as the result of a public election in which the majority shall have approved of such action.

The police powers of the Government shall not be used to harass, coerce, or otherwise, influence citizens to comply with arbitrary rules, regulations, projects or programs of Government agencies, commissions, or bureaus without the specific approval, after review, by Congress; in all matters of conflicts between individuals, or groups of individuals, and any Government agency, actions in the several courts of the Nation shall place the burden of proof of wrongdoing upon the complaining agency, commission, or bureau, and citizens concerned shall be presumed to be innocent until acceptable evidence in the proper court proves the contrary.

Arbitrary penalties and punishments promulgated by Federal Government agencies, commissions, departments or bureaus, without the express approval of Congress, shall be carefully reviewed by competent counsellors before becoming the basic law of the land, and failure to have such review and approval of Congress shall be construed as to make such penalties and punishments null and void and of no effect.

As between States, the Federal Government, nor any of its agencies, branches, commissions or bureaus, will favor or support one as against another; and the courts shall render decisions upon the basis of justice and equity between States, being mindful in all cases that the people's rights are first, States' rights second, and national rights are third, as to disputes arising concerning property and resources. In no case, except upon the considerations of national defense, security, or emergency, shall the National Government and its departments, agencies, commissions, or bureaus, impose its will or desires upon the States or their people, to satisfy bias, prejudice, or advantage because of the viewpoint of any States concerned.

Within the basic law of the land, and the Constitution of the United States, exploration and exploitation of natural resources is reserved to the people, as individuals first, as to the States second, and only within such limitations as may appear to be in the national (not bureaucratic) welfare and interest, to the Federal Government third. The exceptions noted shall not be used as fictions by the Federal Government or its agencies, branches, bureaus, departments, or commissions, to usurp the prerogatives of the States or of the people.

Deficit Spending

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAURENCE CURTIS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 1, 1961

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, a discerning warning on overspending was voiced by Mr. George Minot, managing editor of the Boston Herald, in his column of Sunday, July 30. I include it with these remarks:

ERA OF CHEAP MONEY AHEAD—DOMESTIC SPENDING WAY UP

While you have been worrying about the crisis our finances have been going to pot. In the last few months the administration has been putting new spending programs on the statute books at a rate that should fill a prudent man with horror. The lives of everybody in the country, and those of our children and grandchildren, are being made over by the laws Congress has been passing and the President has been signing.

Hardly an eyebrow was raised the other day—and the story was deemed so unimportant that many papers didn't bother to print it—when Senator WILLIAMS, Republican watchdog from Delaware, told the Senate that the Federal deficit has been mounting at the rate of \$1 million an hour ever since Mr. Kennedy took office. He went on to say that the New Frontier has been expanding Federal payrolls at the rate of more than four employees every 5 minutes since the inaugural.

DEFICIT HORRIFYING SURPRISE

Then this last week it was officially revealed that WILLIAMS was modest in his charges. The Government itself revealed that its budget deficit in the last fiscal year was almost \$4 billion. This was a horrifying surprise, yet it caused not a ripple of alarm. Everybody, you suppose, had forgotten that President Eisenhower, in his final budget message, had estimated a surplus of \$100 million.

The deficit figures mean we have been operating in the red at the rate of around \$150 million a week, and during much of that time you heard double talk about balanced budgets, fewer Government employees and smaller staffs at the higher level. The American people do not begin to realize yet the manner in which Washington is taking control of the lives of almost everybody. There is something for almost everybody—the urban redevelopment people, the historic, recreation and conservation crowd, and of course the farmers, veterans, aged, and ill.

And all these benefits, these promises of easier lives for the student, the home buyer or builder, the civic center lover, and all the others, are coming on top of huge new defense expenditures. Not a soul in authority has suggested we cut back some of the huge political domestic handouts in view of the new defense expenses coming up. You can see \$5 billion of red ink immediately ahead without half trying.

TAXPAYER GETS HEAVIER LOAD

The other day in the midst of some big international blowup somewhere or other, Congress quietly voted to increase the Government's debt limit by \$5 billion dollars—to a total of \$298 billion, an amount that staggers the imagination. In hurried and routine fashion Congress went on to add \$400 million to interstate highway construction in

the new year and the same day assured pensioners' \$825 million a year more in benefits.

Spending plans already approved indicate a budget of \$100 billion a year before the end of Kennedy's first term. Today it is \$87,730 billion. If all of the President's requests are approved by Congress—and so far the Kennedy people have been getting as much or more than they have asked for—between \$40 and \$50 billion will be added to the taxpayer's load over the next 4 years.

All this is being done with the idea that a big boom is now underway and that added taxes coming in will take care of the huge outgo. That is what the spending is for, of course. It is to spur the boom. As the summer drones along—and people either are half worried to death about nuclear war or decide to forget the whole business and go off to the beach—effects of Congress' generosity are not yet being realized.

WATCH SPECK ON THE HORIZON

Business is good, if not spectacular, and prices are steady. There are quite a number of things on the market you can buy cheaper than you could last year at this time. This is a good time to buy what you need. This price stability is not going to last forever. Prices are going up. The value of the dollar is going down. This administration is committed to cheap money.

Deficits are going to be even bigger. It is going to be impossible to hold the wage-price spiral. There is no sense in becoming an alarmist, but next summer's vacation is going to cost you more than this year's, and your dollar next year will not buy as much in the food, clothing, appliance line as it will today.

It may seem silly to yell about inflation when prices have been so stable for so many months, but if you will keep your eye on that speck on the horizon you may see it grow into an inflationary cloud that will come closer to destroying us than anything that comes from foreign shores.

Do not be too sure that this is not the real aim of our enemy in the East—that we spend ourselves into bankruptcy, when the dollar and the doughnut come to have equal value. Then we, and our allies along with us, would be just as much captives of the Commies as if they dropped bombs in a dozen different countries.

SOME URBAN RENEWAL PROJECTS

The Wall Street Journal revealed the other day how utterly fantastic some of these Government spending orgies are. Under the beautiful phrase of "urban renewal," the paper told how the old rivers and harbors pork barrel handouts had been put to shame. It told about the little town of Mercedes, Tex., with some 10,000 people, that got \$234,000 for a new sewer system; of East Granby, Conn., that got \$246,000 for its 2,434 people; of Lithonia, Ga., \$102,000 for its 1,667 people; Atchison, Kans., \$1,916,800 for its 12,500 people.

There was the town of Wink, Tex., where the Federal Government had allotted \$478 for every man, woman, and child of its 1,800 population. This is to remodel the town's business district, "all three blocks of it," goes on the account. The publisher of the Wink Bulletin hit the nail on the head: "You can hardly spend money like this in a little town without doing some good."

This is how former President Eisenhower put it to a Republican gathering in Pennsylvania:

"The picture of Government, as I see it, is of a gigantic Santa Claus, and we're dancing around the Christmas tree, hoping for our presents. But each package is marked in fine print, so we don't have to read it, 'You don't have to pay for this, but your grandchildren will'."

House Resolution 211—Special Committee on Captive Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 1, 1961

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, on March 8, 1961, I introduced a measure calling for the establishment of a Special Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives. This measure is now House Resolution 211. There are not sufficient words to express my profound gratitude and personal delight to the more than 20 Members of the House who joined with me in that most stimulating and very enlightening discussion which took place then on the subject of the captive nations—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 8, 1961, "Russian Colonialism and the Necessity of a Special Captive Nations Committee," pages 3286-3311.

The popular response to House Resolution 211 has been so enthusiastic and impressive that I feel dutybound to disclose the thoughts and feelings of many Americans who have taken the time to write me on this subject. These citizens are cognizant of the basic reasons underlying the necessity of the proposed committee. They understand clearly the vital contribution that such a committee could make to our national security interests. In many cases, they know that no public or private body is in existence today which is devoted to the task of studying continuously, systematically, and objectively all of the captive nations, those in Eastern Europe and Asia, including the numerous captive nations in the Soviet Union itself.

Because their thoughts and sentiments are expressive and valuable, I request that the following responses of our citizens to House Resolution 211 be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD:

KINSTON CLINIC,

Kinston, N.C., July 17, 1961.

DEAR SIR: I wish to go on record as strongly endorsing H.R. 211 which I understand was introduced into the House by you. It is my understanding that H.R. 211 will create a Captive Nation's Committee and that this committee will orient itself toward doing something for the captive nations. In the name of God and humanity this is something that we must undertake. This action is long, long past due.

I trust that all will support this bill and help you as much as possible. I am in great sympathy with your work against the Communist cause.

Sincerely,

J. C. PEELE, M.D.

MAY 24, 1961.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: The House Resolution 211 submitted by you to the House on March 8, 1961 deserves the serious attention of every American.

It is very important at the present moment to study the true nature of our enemy and to gain help of our natural allies (subjugated nations) in our fight against Russian imperialism, the clever tool of which communism happens to be.

Very truly yours,

BORYS HRYWKO.

CLEVELAND, OHIO.

NORWOOD, PA.

Representative DANIEL J. FLOOD.

DEAR SIR: I am intensely interested in your House Resolution 211. I hope you will have great success.

I am very proud of Representative WALTER also.

I think it is a privilege and a duty to help other nations but to give up our privilege is something else.

I am so very glad when I read of our representatives taking a courageous stand—"To help the strong to stand and to raise the weak."

Gratefully yours,

JENNIE VAUGHAN SMITH,
Mrs. Lewis Smith.

JULY 16, 1961.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I heard you on Dean Manion's program last night (July 15). Let me first of all compliment you on your fine efforts in Congress to defeat the spread of communism. Secondly, I would like to obtain a copy of the House Resolution 211 that you mentioned on Manion's Forum. I believe that is the name of the bill you were referring to last night.

Thank you for your time and effort and good luck in Congress.

Sincerely,

BILL RYAN.

SYRACUSE, N.Y.

P.S.—Any related information to this subject would also be appreciated.

SEABROOK, N.J., July 17, 1961.

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
Pennsylvania.

DEAR SIR: My sincere appreciations to you for your courageous stand on the behalf of the enslaved east European nations. Your House Resolution 211—to form a special Committee on the Captive Nations—is a magnificent document.

Being a U.S. citizen of Estonian origin, I shall retain close interest in the progress of the resolution.

Wishing you personal and professional success.

Most sincerely,

JULIAN SIMONSON.

CHARLESTOWN, MASS.

DEAR SIR: I have just heard you on the Dean Manion radio program.

May I say I agree with you 100 percent, and you are to be highly commended for introducing your House Resolution 211.

I shall write to my Congressman (McCORMACK) today. I trust I shall hear you on the Dean Manion program again and I shall get others to write sponsoring House Resolution 211. Thank you.

Sincerely,

HENRY MCCARTHY.

MAY 24, 1961.

DEAR SIR: The House Resolution 211 which you submitted to the House on March 8, 1961, has my fullest support.

With the weapons of truth, the facts and common ideals, it would be possible to overwhelm Moscow's worldwide propaganda campaign in the newly independent and underdeveloped nations.

Therefore, I hope that the new Resolution 211 gets the full support of the Congress.

Very truly yours,

PETRO OPOSKYJ.

CLEVELAND, OHIO.

BROOKFIELD, WIS., July 17, 1961.

Hon. DAN FLOOD,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. FLOOD: Your resolution to create a special committee on captive nations has my full support. Please send me a copy of this resolution (House Resolution 211) and any other materials you have on the issue.

Sincerely,

MARK TIMLER.

UNIVERSITY CLUB,

Washington, D.C., July 18, 1961.

DEAR MR. CONGRESSMAN: May I congratulate you on your House Resolution 211. When manned by patriotic Congressmen like you, the Captive Nations Committee will do a more useful foreign policy job than the Department of State has produced since the New Deal.

Respectfully yours,

JOHN A. GRANLUND.

THE DEMOCRATIC ORGANIZATION OF
UKRAINIANS FORMERLY PERSECUTED BY THE SOVIET REGIME,
Chicago, Ill., July 15, 1961.Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: On behalf of the membership of our organization, we would like to declare our strongest support for your move in introducing the resolution calling for the establishment of a permanent Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives.

We believe that the creation of the committee is not only advisable but essential, for such a committee will serve as the most reliable source of information and data on nations enslaved in the U.S.S.R.

Being of past refugees from the U.S.S.R., we feel we are in a position to pass judgment with ample knowledge upon the state of affairs in the Soviet Union.

We assert that the U.S.S.R. is not a free federation of republics analogous to the federation of American States, nor that the people of the U.S.S.R. do form a single nation. The U.S.S.R. is an empire, consisting of various nations ever eager to escape Soviet Russian slavery. That is the most vulnerable spot in the imperial structure of U.S.S.R.

It is our belief that at the present time of dying colonialism, bringing this fact into sharpest focus would be to the advantage of our Nation, and a precise and most appropriate policy of the U.S. Government with respect to the captive nations would be a most effective weapon in the cold war confronting our Nation today.

We are writing our Congressman, the Honorable DANIEL D. ROSTENKOWSKI, asking him to support your resolution.

Sincerely yours,

T. LYSENKO,

President.

F. REWUNO,

Secretary.

How Much Federal Aid Did the Pilgrims Get?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL L. DEVINE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 1, 1961

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include in the RECORD an editorial which apparently appeared in Trade Journal, Warner & Swasey, Inc., Cleveland, Ohio, entitled "How Much Federal Aid Did the Pilgrims Get?":

HOW MUCH FEDERAL AID DID THE PILGRIMS GET?

They were in a depressed area. No one guaranteed them high prices for anything. Their only roads and schools were built by themselves. For security they did their own saving, or starved.

All they had was character. All they did was work. All they wanted was self respect.

The sum of these three traits became America.

But what's going to be the sum of the traits you see today—the traits of character, or rather lack of it, that demand more money for less work, put security above self-respect, pamper self-pitying criminals instead of punishing them, give away resources we desperately need to protect ourselves, listen to weaklings that want Government to take care of them when they should take care of themselves.

Long years of early-American self-respect and hard work built America, but the traits you see today can destroy it, in half the time.

Preservation of the Bald Eagle in Alaska

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 1, 1961

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I wish to commend to the attention of the Senate an article by an able and distinguished author, our colleague, Senator ERNEST GRUENING, Democrat, of Alaska. The article, entitled "Senator Offers to Share Alaska's Eagles With Other States," printed in the July-August 1961 Audubon magazine, is presented with the same skillful style as other writings to his credit.

Senator GRUENING is also the author of "Mexico and Its Heritage," which was written in 1928, and is still considered the outstanding reference work on that nation. More recently, he published a scholarly book entitled "The State of Alaska," on a subject with which few men could write with more authority.

Starting in 1939, Senator GRUENING served almost 14 years as the Governor of Alaska under the U.S. flag, and was one of the first two men from that new State to be elected Senator, a record of public service and achievement equaled by few Senators. Senator GRUENING is one of the outstanding conservationists of our Nation. His action saved the bald eagle in Alaska.

The Senator's article in the Audubon magazine on Alaska's preservation of bald eagles, our national emblem, is deserving of the attention of all those who believe in the protection of our wildlife. I ask unanimous consent to have his article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Audubon magazine, July-August 1961]

SENATOR OFFERS TO SHARE ALASKA'S EAGLES WITH OTHER STATES—If It's Feasible, 49TH STATE WILL HELP TO TRANSPLANT NATIONAL BIRD, SAYS SENATOR GRUENING—NATIONAL AUDUBON SOCIETY'S BALD EAGLE SURVEY WINS HIS SUPPORT

(By ERNEST GRUENING, U.S. Senator From Alaska)

The continental study of the bald eagle now being conducted by National Audubon Society is a most commendable effort to prevent the extinction of our national bird—especially in the contiguous 48 States.

We in Alaska are proud of our abundance of bald eagles there and I would like to urge strongly that, after suitable studies, an effort be made to transplant some of these birds to the lower 48 States.

It has been a great source of satisfaction to me to see eagles in great numbers in my home State. They can be seen soaring over Juneau, the capital, and, on a recent trip from Haines to Klukwan, a distance of perhaps 14 miles, I counted 64 bald eagles.

It has been my privilege to take a leading part in providing protective legislation for the bald eagle in Alaska, especially in bringing to an end the bounty system which resulted in the killing of some 150,000 of these splendid birds. I particularly want to set the record straight about the period during which the bounty was paid.

Articles have appeared (not in Audubon magazine) stating erroneously that from 1917 to 1952 Alaska paid a bounty for killing the bald eagle.

A similar error also occurred in an important book on the birds of Alaska which says that the Bounty Act was repealed on March 2, 1953. These statements are incorrect by a number of years.

The Eagle Bounty Act was repealed on March 21, 1945. I would like to explain the exact circumstances which led to the repeal of the Eagle Bounty Act and the subsequent protection of the eagle in Alaska, all of which have led to the tremendous proliferation of this noble bird in Alaska and the possibility, which I have suggested, of transplanting some of these eagles to States where they are extinct.

When I came to Alaska as Governor in 1939, I noted how widely the system of bounty payments, in order to destroy animals which were considered detrimental commercially, was used, and was particularly shocked at its application to the eagle. I communicated with various experts and sought all the literature available. My study convinced me that the eagle, for the killing of which a bounty of \$1 was paid under an Alaska law, was by no means a serious predator, and that such losses as might result from its predation would be more than offset by other values if the species could be preserved.

In my first message to the Alaska Legislature in 1941, I treated the subject of bounties very fully, saying:

"Over a quarter million dollars—\$260,000—were expended on bounty payments in the last biennium on wolves, coyotes, hair seals, eagles, and trout. The usefulness of these various bounties, the amount of damage done by the predators on which the bounties are paid, the effectiveness of the bounty method of extermination as against some other method where extermination appears desirable—these are varying controversial issues. With so large a sum involved it would seem only proper that those who desire to expend these public moneys should assume the burden of proof that these expenditures are essential and represent the best method of dealing with the situation.

"Since the last meeting of the Territorial Legislature, eagles, on which the Territory has been paying a bounty of \$1, have been protected by Federal statute. It is now against the law to kill an eagle anywhere in the United States except in Alaska. While Alaska was exempted out of consideration for existing Territorial legislation it would seem reasonable for us to move in the direction of practice now established everywhere else and at least to cease paying a bounty on this national bird.

"Twenty-five thousand dollars was appropriated for the last biennium for Dolly Varden trout bounties. There seems to be little question that quantities of rainbow trout tails and young salmon tails have been included in the trophies presented for collection. Further, Dolly Varden trout are

admittedly predators on stickleback which in turn are destructive on salmon. The Fish and Wildlife Service has expressed to me its view that such expenditures are unwarranted unless and until careful research establishes their value. However, this is a question for the Legislature to decide. Meanwhile no request has been made for funds to continue eagle and trout bounties. (This means that I did not request the customary appropriated item for eagle bounties.)

"The matter is treated more fully in the current biennial report of the Territorial Board of Budget, signed by the treasurer, auditor and Governor, and I commend this fuller treatment to your attention. A good deal of the bounty legislation in the past has been in part motivated by the economic needs of Alaskans, who are assisted through these bounties. It is, I think, desirable not to confuse this issue with relief. Federal and Territorial appropriations are increasingly taking care of that aspect of the problem."

However, legislation which I had introduced to suspend the payment of bounty on eagles was not enacted by the 1941 Legislature. The legislators reflected the generally held belief of the people of Alaska that the eagle was a predator on salmon, the salmon fishery being Alaska's principal industry, and it was alleged that eagles also preyed on poultry, young lambs, etc. So, unable to get this legislation repealed, I deleted the appropriation item for eagle bounties from the appropriation bill which had been inserted into it, although I had purposely omitted that item. This meant that no bounties were paid during the following biennium. However, until the law was repealed, those who shot eagles were still entitled to the bounty, and the accumulated eagle claws of the birds that had been killed became a mounting obligation for the Territorial treasury.

In the next session—in 1943—I again urged the elimination of the eagle bounty, and when this was not forthcoming, I again deleted the item from the appropriation bill.

In the 1945 session, I was able to secure the passage of an act repealing the eagle bounty, and that act (ch. 31 of the session laws of that year was signed by me on March 21, 1945.

Immediately thereafter, I requested the Fish and Wildlife Service to take the necessary steps to see that the eagle was protected by amending the law which had been passed by Congress protecting the eagle throughout the Union but which specifically excluded Alaskan eagles from that protection. This exclusion resulted from the efforts of the then Delegate in Congress, Anthony J. Dimond, who was also reflecting Alaskan sentiment of that day, and based his successful efforts to get Alaska excluded from the Federal protection on the fact that the Territorial law provided bounty for killing the eagle. (However, that amendment of the Federal act did not take place for some years.)

Meanwhile, in Alaska, in the absence of the dollar incentive to shoot an eagle, the eagles began to proliferate immediately. This is highly gratifying to me, as it is to most Alaskans, and it is my earnest hope that we will be able to share our birds with the other States.

There are two ways by which this could be done. One is by our fellow Americans coming to Alaska and seeing the eagles. The Haines-Port Chilkoot scenic area is even stressing in its travel folder that "here is an opportunity to photograph the American bald eagle by the dozen in its last resting ground." So it is clear that apart from the abstract and spiritual values in preserving our national bird, there is also a practical and material value.

The other way in which Alaskans could share the eagle would be, as I have suggested, by transplanting some of the birds to the lower 48 States. That is a matter for ornithologists to study. I hope it may prove to be practical.

Let Us Not Be Trapped

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONARD FARBSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 1, 1961

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of my colleagues a timely article on Moscow's relations with Cairo, contained in the latest issue of *Prevent World War III*, published by the Society for the Prevention of World War III, Inc., a non-profit educational organization, 515 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y. This article, entitled "Let Us Not Be Trapped," exposes the basic fallacies behind the assertion that current differences between the Kremlin and Cairo imply that a break is in the offing. This reasoning also assumes that it would be to the interests of the United States to bend over backward so as to accommodate Mr. Nasser at this time. However, as this article so cogently argues, Nasser is too committed to the Soviets to play the role of an anti-Communist crusader, and furthermore, it is to his advantage to play the East against the West. This article reveals that Nasser's anti-U.S. policies have not changed. Therefore, it would be the height of folly to permit the current differences between Nasser and the Kremlin to blind us with regard to their common enmity toward our country. The article follows:

LET US NOT BE TRAPPED

(By Dr. Albert Simard)

In recent weeks reports have appeared in the Western press concerning the current war of words between Moscow and Cairo. According to these dispatches, Premier Khrushchev himself has allegedly lost confidence in Nasser's leadership. The Soviet press has denounced the Cairo regime for trying to curry favor with the "Western imperialists" by harassing Arab Communists. Cairo, in turn, accuses the Soviets of interfering in the internal affairs of the U.A.R.

The charges and countercharges have aroused the expectations of American editorial writers, columnists, and anonymous U.S. Government officials. They share the belief that a break may be in the offing and that now is the time for the United States to "cash in" by weaning Nasser from his Soviet benefactors.

Yet, only 2 years ago, the world witnessed a similar bout between Cairo and the Kremlin. Then, Nasser gave exclusive interviews to American reporters in which he warned the United States that the Soviet Union was on the verge of swallowing up the Middle East, Africa, and South America. Implicit in Nasser's dire admonitions was the proposition that, if the United States were more understanding with respect to Nasser's aspirations, he would prove to be a firm barrier to Communist designs.

The New York Times summed up the immediate reason for Nasser's conversion at that time: "Nasser was the hero of the Arab

world. Today, he is virtually isolated (Apr. 4, 1959). The New York Times' estimate was based on the fact that Nasser's effort to subvert neighboring Arab countries, in line with his dreams of empire stretching from the Atlantic to the Persian Gulf, had gone for naught. Moreover, Nasser's political drive was aggravated by the growing bankruptcy of the Egyptian economy. Obviously, such a serious state of affairs required substantial dollar injections and Nasser hoped that his anti-Communist sales talk would do the trick.

While Western journalists were being briefed about the Red danger, Nasser made sure that the door to the Kremlin never closed. In January 1959, he sent Khrushchev a cable full of effusive praise and admiration, both for the Soviet dictator and the Soviet policy. "The Soviet Union's real assistance," he told Khrushchev, "and appreciated effort is met by us with veneration and esteem." Three months later, one of Nasser's leading commentators told the Arab world: "There is no difference between dollar and ruble slavery."

Today, the conjunction of circumstances has once again prompted Mr. Nasser to frown at Moscow and smile at the West. His foreign policies in the Arab world and in Africa are floundering. Many of the newly created states are keeping Nasser at arm's length. The very nature of Nasser's rule does not permit such embarrassment and, therefore, he is desperately seeking a new and more spectacular posture. Furthermore, the Nasser government has initiated a grandiose industrialization program which will require hundreds of millions of dollars annually. Mr. Nasser is perfectly aware that U.S. aid programs are now up for discussion. It is, therefore, not surprising that he should broadcast to the West his brand of anti-Communism, just as he did 2 years ago.

In view of the foregoing, it would be most tragic if the U.S. Government allowed itself to be ensnared by Nasser's "new look." Two years ago, Nasser warned the United States about Soviet inroads in Africa. However, the Nasser regime proved during the Congo crisis that it was as vicious a foe of the United States (and U.N. policy) as the Soviet Union. Two years ago, Mr. Nasser appeared to be concerned about Soviet inroads in Latin America. However, Nasser's own agents in Panama have striven to do as much damage to U.S. interests there as the Soviet Union. Furthermore, Nasser has played a major role in egging on Castro and his cohorts to incite the peoples of Latin America against the United States.

In the last analysis, the crux of the issue is Nasser's attitude toward the United States. No government, during this postwar period, outside of the Soviet bloc, has shown such animosity and hatred toward the United States as the Nasser regime.

The idea that the United States may now be able to win over Nasser by generous dollar handouts is a "pipe dream." The United States has given hundreds of millions of dollars worth of aid to the U.A.R., but this generosity has not altered Nasser's anti-U.S. policies. Secondly, Soviet grants to the U.A.R., including military aid, total over \$1 billion. The close economic link-up between the Egyptian economy and the Soviet bloc is a fact of life. Nasser cannot be "pried loose" by additional dollar handouts. In this connection, the Cairo radio network recently carried the following commentary on American aid: "The countries which get more aid from the United States are those which are causing more tension in the international situation and more harm to world peace. The United States has incurred the enmity of the Arab people as a whole" (May 27, 1961).

The present battle of words between Moscow and Cairo does not alter the underlying nature of relations between them. (Is it not

perfectly conceivable that this propaganda warfare was deliberately contrived by both parties in order to trap Uncle Sam?) It is most essential that the United States develop a long-term and realistic policy in the Middle East so as to strengthen our position and prestige in that area of the world. Hasty measures prompted by the devious tactics of an unscrupulous dictator are no substitute for such a policy.

"One recent (U.S.) loan was for a modern communications system between the Egyptian and Syrian regions of the U.A.R. which will be of considerable help to Mr. Nasser in tightening his grip on his empire. It can be argued that this is hardly in the interests of the United States or of the Syrian people, who have little chance to express anything but patriotic feelings these days. Mr. Nasser is still putting a periodic squeeze on Jordan. The new American-financed communications system should help him considerably when the time comes for the next squeeze" (New York Herald Tribune, Mar. 26, 1961).

Doctor in Britain Warns of Socialized Medicine Evils

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 1, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, for those who point to the British system of socialized medicine as an example of why we should adopt a similar program in the United States, I would like to call attention to the following letter I received from a doctor in Britain and also an article he enclosed from the *Daily Telegraph*, a British newspaper:

DEAR MR. ALGER: I have read in the *Journal of the American Medical Association* of the contretemps regarding a Mrs. Muench of Gonzales.

I thought that you would like to read the enclosed news-cutting from our oldest and very reputable medical journal, although not our most widely circulated, unfortunately.

If the U.S. doctors wish to try a State-sponsored health service, let them read this article to appreciate what has happened to the British doctors, members of a now underprivileged profession. How I wish that I could practice in the United States.

Yours very sincerely,

A. A.

PRIVATE COURT FINES ON DOCTORS CONDEMNED—COMPLAINT THAT MINISTER IS JUDGE AND JURY

The method of fining doctors who do not treat their patients properly by private courts violates the most elementary legal rights of the practitioner, the *Medical Press* says today. The minister is both judge and jury and once he has dismissed an appeal the doctor is powerless.

The journal comments on a speech by Mr. Powell, Minister of Health, at Winchester on May 24, in which he referred to "the curious sort of court by which an Englishman is tried if he happens to be a doctor."

The decision whether action is taken by the medical services committee or local executive council against a doctor rests with the clerk to the council, a bureaucrat with no legal training.

The committee consists of members of the executive council, usually minor local

politicians and includes a number of doctors, none of whom, unless by accident, has any legal training.

SEVERE PENALTIES—NO RULES OF EVIDENCE

After deliberation a decision is made. It may involve the infliction of a penalty of as much as several thousands of pounds, far larger than is inflicted for most felonies.

And it is all so delightfully informal. There are no rules of evidence. There is no cross-examination by a trained lawyer; indeed he is the one person scrupulously excluded from the proceedings. There is no evidence on oath, and consequently, no risk of prosecution for perjury.

The Medical Press says that the conclusion is inescapable that the proceedings represent in reality sittings of the minister's private court in which he is both judge and jury. The most elementary legal rights of the practitioner were violated during the court.

The fact that they may be conducted with scrupulous fairness does not in any way alter the fact. Nor can any amount of dialectical subtlety gloss it over.

SUPPRESSION OF NAMES—SYSTEM WAS INHERITED

On the reasonable question of why the names of defrauding doctors should be suppressed and those of defrauding green-grocers or bookmakers freely revealed, the answer was that the doctors had "not been found guilty by common law but by private tribunal." A doctor deprived unjustly of £20 could do nothing about it.

The Minister, "clearly uneasy at the position," is not blamed for the system which he had inherited from his predecessors. They, too, had merely extended a process that had been growing for a generation, "the insulation of the bureaucracy against the law." The guilt lay with Members of Parliament.

The proceedings of the "courts" usually received the widest publicity in the Press. If the public concluded that doctors were "a pack of rogues," it could scarcely be blamed, says the journal.

For Safer Highways

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 3, 1961

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Gordon W. Rule, a much-respected attorney of Washington, D.C., has recently written a letter which was published in the Washington Post.

This letter suggests that the States take decisive action to halt the ever-increasing holocaust that takes place on our highways particularly during long holiday weekends.

Mr. Rule helped prepare the Small Boat Act and urged support for its passage. In proposing this legislation he was particularly concerned with the great loss of life as the result of unregulated motor boat operations.

No subject is of more importance to Americans than the great loss of life on our highways. In view of this, Mr. Rule's comments are most timely.

Under consent to extend my remarks, I wish to insert Mr. Rule's letter in the

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for your interest and that of my colleagues:

FOR SAFER HIGHWAYS

Prior to the Fourth of July holiday, the radio repeatedly urged motorists to drive carefully. During the 4-day period of this holiday, the same radio gave a running account of the death toll from traffic accidents which ultimately set a new and sorry record. This same routine will be dusted off and repeated over the Labor Day holiday—when perhaps another record of fatalities will be set on our Nation's highways.

It so happened that I drove to an ocean beach that weekend and when I went the posted speed limit, every other car on the road passed me despite signs reading, "Speeders Lose Licenses." This mortifying experience, plus the radio news, made me think again about the 40,000 people being killed each year by automobiles.

The more I thought about this annual slaughter the more it seemed incredible that effective means had not been devised to substantially reduce these deaths. I recalled the agitation for seat belts, the radar enforcement techniques, the suspension or revocation of the operator's license exercise, the requirement of financial responsibility of the owner, etc., all of which have some merit but obviously have not solved the problem.

In analyzing this problem, I came to two basic conclusions: first, the driving of a motor car must be considered as a privilege rather than a right in our society; and, secondly, the serious nature of the problem warrants the use of severe corrective measures. In short, I believe the time has come to not spare some peoples' feelings, in the attempt to save other peoples' lives.

Reasoning from these two conclusions, I believe there is a way—if the States have the courage to embrace it—to impress car owners with their responsibilities to such an extent that accidents and fatalities will be drastically reduced.

The States today have two controls they can exercise over the operator by reason of the driver's license they require and they have control over the car by reason of the license tags they require.

Specifically, I would urge all of the States to authorize the suspension or revocation for cause and after proper hearing, of the license plates for the car itself, in addition to the individual operator's permit. This means a physical removal of the plates from the car. (One State recently passed such a law.)

If a car owner knows that his or her investment in that car can be immobilized by reason of having no tags, I am sure much more attention would be paid to careful and prudent driving. Actually, the entire family would see to it that the car was properly driven and each member of the family would become an enforcement officer.

Extreme? Hard on the whole family? Of course the answer is "Yes," but isn't it time we did more than try to impress drivers with signs reading, "Speeders Lose Licenses," when convicted speeders are left with the same car to get in and drive without a license? And we know they do just exactly that.

Certainly it's a tough suggestion, but that's the only way to deal with a condition that takes 40,000 lives a year in this country. Suspend or revoke the license tag for the car, in addition to the driver's permit, and you will make converts out of a lot of otherwise careless drivers. Such treatment would quickly get home the point that driving a car is a privilege and not a right and until that is accomplished we are simply "spinning our wheels."

I repeat, the time has come to not spare some peoples' feelings, in the attempt to save other peoples' lives.

GORDON W. RULE.

Now, Just Why Did You Join the Peace Corps?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 1, 1961

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, I have been very encouraged by several of the excellent reports I have received on the progress being made by the Peace Corps volunteers training on the Berkeley campus of the University of California for secondary school teaching assignments in Ghana.

Since many of us know very little about these training programs, I would like to bring my colleagues attention to a very interesting article which appeared in the July 16 San Francisco Chronicle describing a typical day of training for these dedicated young Americans:

NOW, JUST WHY DID YOU JOIN THE PEACE CORPS?

(By Nancy Griffin)

At 7:45 a.m. under a hospitably warm July sun, the dusty-green Berkeley campus is redolent of eucalyptus and of that California shrub which always smells like burnt sugar.

But room 22 of Earl Warren Hall has only a new-classroom smell of institutional varnish.

No windows, either; nothing but a slide projector in the back, a brown blackboard (a brownboard?) up front, with an outdated map of west Africa pulled partly down over it, two large "No-smoking" signs—and rows and rows of seats, a lot of them already filled by young men. (The girls got there on time, all right; it was just that most of the early birds seemed to be male.)

"Soyez bienvenue" says one of them, after assuring me this was indeed the classroom headquarters of Peace Corps trainees at the University of California. (By the end of the day I discover the 58 Corps volunteers at Berkeley are spending a good 7 hours daily in that room, Saturdays included.)

That is as close as I come to an official welcome. No one pays much attention as I settle back into a seat high in the back and watch the rest of the class drift in, the barelegged girls in their summer dresses slightly outnumbered by the men, the whole group indistinguishable from any college class—except maybe by the absence of horse-play. Likewise plenty of laughter, but no giggling.

There are still about 10 minutes to check through my sheaf of background material—a mimeographed roster of the volunteers' names, ages and backgrounds; a Washington description of the project; the university's release on the "rigorous and rewarding" training program, "under eyes at least as critical as those (the volunteer) can expect abroad."

I knew beforehand that this University of California contingent is one of three pioneer Peace Corps units. (The others are at Rutgers and at Texas Western College.) After 8 weeks at Cal, the Berkeley volunteers expect to be sent to Ghana, which has asked for American teachers to staff the new secondary schools it's building at the rate of one every other month.

But not until Ghana's President Kwame Nkrumah formally signs contracts with the United States, and himself makes the an-

nouncement, can this legitimately be called "Project Ghana." Meanwhile, these volunteers are officially said to be training for service in "some west African nation."

In any case, Dr. Nkrumah has probably never had more devoted American readers: Stacked on nearly every volunteer's notebook is the red-yellow-and-green paperback edition of "Ghana," Nkrumah's autobiography.

At 8 a.m.: Dr. William Stiles starts a 2-hour session of health education with a discussion of hemorrhaging and shock, followed by a Navy film on first aid (or in Government language, "Personnel Damage Control"). Most graphic.

Later Dr. Stiles announces a night meeting at Herrick Hospital, where volunteers are to get emergency room experience: "Perhaps you will see an autopsy or two." ("A bit of a sadist, isn't he?" murmurs a volunteer to his neighbor.) Next is pulse-feeling; it's like being in a nurse's aid training class again.

At 9 a.m.: Ten-minute break; everyone scrounges for dimes to feed the coffee machine across the way, or sprawls on the lawn with cigarettes. (Books, board and lodging are all provided by the Corps. Extras, of course—the cigarettes, the coffee and cokes—comes out of the volunteers' \$2-a-day salary. That would be 25 cents an hour, if these were 8-hour days.)

I make my first mistake: "Why did you join the Peace Corps?" I inquire of a friendly girl in gray gingham who asked me to sit by her.

She stays friendly. But like nearly all her fellows, she is defensive about reporters and tired of being asked that question—by people at home, by newspapermen, by the examining psychiatrists from Langley Porter.

At 9:10 a.m.: More health education: fire prevention and artificial respiration, by Fire Chief Al Hanson, who's taken the trouble to brief himself on Ghana. Four volunteers willingly volunteer to stretch out and help demonstrate the back pressure-arm lift method. As supplements, the Red Cross has furnished enough booklets to go around.

(I am puzzled at first by all this harping on medical techniques. But it makes good sense to Project Director Dr. Morton Gordon of the university extension, who is administering the program. "Over in Africa," he says, "any European—which means any American, too—is automatically regarded as an authority on practically anything, especially away from the cities.")

At 10 a.m.: Half-hour break. Dr. Stiles suggests practicing artificial respiration on the grass, but the sprinklers are going. Dozens of volunteers converse, though they're inclined to freeze if I make a move toward writing anything down. Among them:

Maureen Pyne, 22, a Chicago redhead who got her B.S. from Alabama's Spring Hill College. ("She speaks and writes French fluently," says the official roster.)

Steve McWilliams, 22, with a 1961 B.A. in conservation from the University of Colorado. ("Among his special studies were ornithology and the teaching of geography. He has worked summers as a forest laborer, airplane cleaner, kitchen helper, and janitor.")

Susan Bartholomew, 23, from Minneapolis, with bangs and a thick cute pigtail. ("Graduate studies at Harvard, A.B. magna cum laude from Boston University, Phi Beta Kappa, working knowledge of French, elementary Russian, spent the summer of 1960 in Guinea with 'Operation Crossroads-Africa.'")

Ed Mycue, 24, of Dallas, who has been going to school and working in Boston at

its educational TV station. ("He was graduated magna cum laude, is skilled as an automobile mechanic, carpenter, plumber, and metal worker.")

Arnold Zeitlin, 29, with degrees from Pennsylvania and Columbia's Graduate School of Journalism. Arrived late because he had to give a week's notice to the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette where he was TV and movie critic.

Nearly all are still surprised (it is only the program's third day) to find themselves in Berkeley.

"I was in such a hurry," says a girl from Philadelphia, "I walked straight out of the house without my coat." Peace Corps examinations had been between May 27 and June 5.

With remarkable speed, Washington had somehow between then and the end of the month weeded out those it wanted, run security checks (including six references apiece), paid some attention to preferences—although a good share hadn't mentioned Africa—and, by telegram and last-minute telephone calls, collected its choices at Cal by the pre-Fourth of July weekend.

At 10:30 a.m.: African history and anthropology by Dr. Robert Lystad of Johns Hopkins, who clearly loves his subject. (During the time he and his wife lived in west Africa, the Africans he dealt with called him "the children's white friend"; and when they left, the Lystads rated a farewell ceremonial libation of gin and chicken. I got this not from Professor Lystad but from the jacket blurb on his book "The Ashanti," another piece of required reading.)

We cover 11 centuries before lunch, stopping frequently for questions from the class on slavery and the slave trade. Fascinating names along the way: Fernando Poo, a person (first to cross the Equator) as well as an island. And the Oni of Ife, still potent religious leader of the long-flourishing Oyo-Yoruba Empire (geographically next door to Ghana in what's now Nigeria). When we get to the Ashanti Tribe of northern Ghana, "I'll try not to be prejudiced," says Dr. Lystad, "but they're my people."

At 12:30 p.m.: Long hot walk across campus ("that's how they plan to keep us in condition") to International House for lunch. This is where the volunteers are staying, except for Richard and Antonette Port, the only married couple in the project, who balked at being installed in separate wings. ("I told them that was one sacrifice I wouldn't make for the Corps," says Richard.)

Youngest volunteer is 19 and the oldest 35. Most are between 22 and 24. "But you mustn't trust that list," a girl warns me as I check the roster again. "It's not very accurate. They have me down as 22, and I'm really 23."

Age seems irrelevant anyway: These are adults. They wear their learning lightly, too. I have to keep checking the roster to find out all they've accomplished in their first fifth or quarter of a century. No wonder their hackles rise when foes of the program call them "Kennedy's Kiddies."

At 1:30 p.m.: Back to Warren Hall for a lecture by David Apter, associated professor of political science at Cal and director of studies for this Peace Corps program. He too is an authority on Ghana, where he has lived; one of his books is also on the required reading list.

We spend the afternoon wrapping up the history of colonialism. This isn't so superficial as it sounds. Professor Apter is jamming in facts at a great clip, hardly stopping for breath. Moreover, it appears that each volunteer is expected to reorganize his notes for each course into a usable, readable, text-book, augmented by outside reading.

"African history is not only long but deep," Dr. Apter emphasizes, "and no less deep for our ignorance of it."

There is a short break somewhere in mid-afternoon, when I consider trying the why-did-you-join-the-Corps question again. I am deterred, by a voice in another conversation floating across the lawn: "Tell the next person who asks you: 'Well, the Foreign Legion has closed down and I wanted to run away from home.'"

At 4 p.m.: Lectures over. Other days there'll be still other subjects: American problems—political, economic, social, international—and about 75 hours in British educational philosophy as it's practiced in Ghana. When things are organized, there'll be an hour and a half of physical training in the late afternoon—swimming and barefoot soccer, among other sports, for the men; swimming and ping pong for the girls. "I hear that ping pong is practically Ghana's national pastime," says one of them.

At 5:45 p.m.: After-dinner coffee in the sun with Peter Dybwad ("22; New Jersey; history major at Wesleyan; outstanding job as chairman of blood bank drive, has traveled in West Africa," says the roster); Barney Chessin, Rahway, N.J. history teacher ("23; fluent in Hebrew; working knowledge of French"); bearded Bob Klein, 32-year-old New York City teacher; and 1960 Stanford geography major Susan Hastings.

The university has thoughtfully installed a red screen in the International House dining room so that volunteers can eat behind it en masse, undisturbed. Nobody does. But they still talk mostly shop: The language training in Ghana's national Twi (pronounced more or less Tschvee), to be given by Ghanaian students in the United States, has been postponed until the following week.

The next morning is to be practice-teaching. Most volunteers—perhaps 80 or 90 percent—are trained teachers, but not necessarily experienced, yet.

Geographically, the group hails from nearly everywhere except the Deep South. A couple are Negroes—one of them, Ray Spriggs, of West Chester, Pa., a 1960 graduate of Nkrumah's alma mater, Lincoln University.

Several seem concerned with what hard-bitten newsmen think of them. But they appear to have a calm self-confidence unmarred by brashness or unduly starry eyes.

At 8 p.m.: After another long walk, we get to Herrick Hospital just at dusk, in time for a cigarette on the roof as the lights come on in the hills and across the bay. "This isn't really worse than the schedule we had at home in Boston," says Antonette Port. "Both of us were getting up at 6:30, and going to school and teaching at the same time."

At 8:15 p.m.: Dr. Stiles once more, with Herrick's staff doctors and nurses, explaining the 3-hour shifts the volunteers will take by twos in the hospital emergency room—daily and throughout weekends as their schedules permit. (There go their free Sundays.) We also get a short tour of the hospital—but no autopsy tonight.

At 10:30 p.m.: The corps saunters by twos and threes back to International House to start their night's studying. I'm on a bus for home, exhausted. But in the end I even have an answer to that question: "It's almost too simple to talk about," says one girl. "We don't expect to be miracle workers, but I think we all feel we have an obligation to the world. And things are going backward fast enough as it is without our standing by and not trying to stop them."

Nothing New in the Recent Communist Manifesto

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 1, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, many people, some even Members of this body, seem to be unduly impressed by the fanfare with which the latest Communist manifesto was announced. Some see in it cause for fear of a dynamic society which threatens, through peaceful co-existence, the rest of the free world. Others read into the proposals new military strategy with which we cannot cope. A calm, reasonable analysis of the statement shows that there is nothing new in the Communist world. The people are promised the same "workers paradise" except the time of achievement has been set ahead. The world is warned, although not too openly, that the basic concept of communism, world domination has not changed and that every immoral, unethical, or cunning scheme will be used against all free societies.

The Communist program is no threat to free governments or to free people. Under our system of free enterprise, we need no paternal government to keep us strong and to move our economy ahead. The slave states of communism can never catch the free world in an economic race. We need not fear the military might of the Communists if we recognize the objective, our own destruction. We can keep ahead in military strength by maintaining a strong and solvent economy, spending our defense money on nuclear power, and rooting out and exposing subversion where it is gnawing away at the foundations of our national structure.

Two interesting views of the Russian proposals are contained in the following editorials, the first from the Wall Street Journal and the second from today's New York Times:

[From the Wall Street Journal]

THE CHALLENGE OF HOT AIR

From the reaction of some people in Congress, you would think the Kremlin had done something vitally important in issuing the new draft program of the Soviet Communist Party.

Senator FULBRIGHT solemnly declares that the big question is the maturity of our response, adding that we must develop our economy. Senator MANSFIELD says that if the American people ignore this challenge, it will prove we are taking too much for granted and not using our capabilities to the full. He also observes that the foreign-aid bill's prospects have picked up, and that the President's domestic program must also be passed, in the light of this new challenge.

And what, pray, is this dramatic new challenge? It's just hot air and wild promises, expressed in the purest pie-in-the-sky language. For example, here is a forecast of life in the Soviet Union in the near future:

"The people's standard of living and their cultural and technical standards will improve substantially; everyone will live in easy circumstances; all collective and state

farms will become highly productive and profitable enterprises; the demand of the Soviet people for well-appointed housing will in the main be satisfied; hard physical work will disappear; the U.S.S.R. will become the country with the shortest working day."

Any tourist who has had a chance to take a close look at the Soviet Union knows what poppycock all this is. There are the vast slums of the cities, with the people jammed together and using communal kitchens and bathrooms; even the new construction is shoddy. Speaking of the disappearance of hard physical work, old women still sweep the streets with primitive brooms.

Out in the country one often feels as though he has just moved back about a hundred years. As for Soviet agriculture becoming productive and profitable, that will be the day; farming is perhaps the greatest single Red economic failure.

Living conditions are gradually improving somewhat; yet, ironically, the new program in some ways appears to be a retreat from earlier promises. It is much vaguer, in terms of economic goals, than some experts expected. It pushes some of the promised material blessings off as far as 1980, whereas Khrushchev has talked of catching up with the United States sooner than that.

We suspect that the American people understand better than some Senators the true nature of the Soviet challenge. There is a challenge, all right, but it is a challenge of aggressive militarism and space technology. The Soviets have been able to create such a challenge by preventing their own people from attaining decent living conditions, and that is still the main direction of their policy. So the one thing we do not have to worry about is a challenge in Soviet living standards.

Certainly cheap Soviet talk is no justification for the administration's lavish spending at home and abroad. It is hardly logical to use a threatened rise in Red living standards as an excuse for more of the Government spending that can damage this country's financial and economic underpinnings—and thus threaten our own living standards.

To be sure, it's not surprising that American politicians should seize on this document to push their own schemes. But they are not doing any service for the American people. They ought to reflect on what is perhaps the best comment on the new program; it comes not from Washington but from a Moscow hotel maid: "Fine promises, but I shall be in my grave by then."

[From the New York Times]

THE NEW COMMUNIST MANIFESTO

This newspaper devotes eight pages today to the full text of the latest Communist manifesto, the so-called third Soviet program, embodying the basic ideas of Premier Khrushchev. As the Soviet dictator is the most powerful adversary of the free world, and as the first maxim of survival must always be "know thine enemy," this document should be studied by all who value freedom. This is Premier Khrushchev's counterpart to Hitler's "Mein Kampf," and the world can neglect it only at its peril.

The importance of this document to the outside world lies not in its profusion of pie-in-the-sky promises to deflect attention from the continued shabbiness and the physical and spiritual hunger of Soviet life, nor in its fantastic picture of a future Utopia where everything shall be free except freedom.

Its overriding importance lies in Premier Khrushchev's renewed proclamation that the Soviets can reach their unalterable goal of complete communism, including the withering away of the state, only when the whole world has become Communist, and that meanwhile they will use the Soviet state as a power apparatus to bring this about.

In short, this is a new declaration of war against the free world—military, political, economic, and propagandistic war. It expands in thousands of words what the Soviet chieftain compressed in four words: "We shall bury you."

This is both a Communist and a Russian document. Through it marches an older Russian imperialism which conquered all neighboring peoples and expanded the Duchy of Muscovy into the Russian Empire, now stretching from the Elbe to the Bering Strait. Through it runs the Messianic faith of the Russian soul that Russia has the mission to save the world—a faith of many facets which first proclaimed Moscow to be the "third Rome" of a Christian world and now the center of the Communist world.

All these elements are mobilized and tied into the Communist doctrine to give it greater potency, including the Russian sense of timelessness which always looks not to the present but to the future for fulfillment. But Soviet strategy does not depend on them alone. It seeks to avoid a nuclear war that would destroy the "Communist motherland," but short of such a war all means must be used to reach the goal.

Therefore, under the guise of "peaceful coexistence," it continues to stir up revolutions and Communist "wars of liberation," to exploit nationalism where it serves its purposes and to denounce it where it does not, to try to wreck all free world defense organizations, to lure the new and still inexperienced states into its net and above all to seek to disarm the free world while keeping its own arms intact.

The world has been warned again.

Drill Press Operator Speaks Eloquenty for His Country

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 1, 1961

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, Lester L. Poteet is a drill press operator in a California aircraft factory. He is sick and tired of this country being kicked around. He has suggestions as to what is wrong and what the remedies are. Recently he wrote me about it. Although I do not agree with all Mr. Poteet had to say, the substance of it seems to be a fairly accurate expression of the American people's instinct for national survival. I, for one, have a tremendous respect for the collective judgment and wisdom of the American people, as well as a hearty respect for that survival instinct. I have asked that Mr. Poteet's letter be reproduced here because it is well that those in Government pause occasionally to acquire the essence of the people's thoughts, which in the end, is the strength of our Nation.

Congressman CRAIG HOSMER,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. HOSMER: The overthrow of the U.S. Government from within has been in the making for some time. For years the people attributed the disastrous results of our foreign policy merely to stupidity and to the ineptness of our high officials. But more than stupidity is rampant in Wash- ington.

Our State Department effectively delivered the peoples of China into the hands of the Reds. One of the master architects of this act of great infamy was Owen Lattimore, a member of the Council on Foreign Relations. Mr. Lattimore worked from a desk in the State Department. At the time of this writing, Lattimore is in Outer Mongolia striving to have that Red satellite admitted to the United Nations. Our President has promised to give his (Lattimore's) "expert opinion" serious consideration. Of course Cuba is the place where one worldism in the State Department became so bold discretion was forgotten. Our State Department supported Fidel Castro. State Department-backed Fidel Castro was given diplomatic recognition and a fond pat on the head, this in the light of evidence to show the State Department had been thoroughly informed of Castro's Red connections.

Meanwhile, back at the U.N., that "stallwart" fighter for the United States, Adlai Stevenson (a member of the Council on Foreign Relations) is working industriously for the admittance of Red China into that organization. An article datelined London quoted Mr. Macmillan—after his visit with the President—to the effect that Mr. Kennedy told him (Macmillan) it would take a year to prepare the American people to accept the seating of Red China in the United Nations. Chiang Kai-shek is enraged, and rightfully so, at the impending sellout of his people and of Formosa which he feels is imminent. Our State Department, and President Eisenhower (a member of the Council on Foreign Relations) squashed our friends, England and France, when they went into the Suez to stand up for their rights granted by treaty. The Cuban invaders were doomed to slaughter and capture on the beaches when some as yet unnamed person or persons rescinded the air support promised them. These Cuban patriots were fighting for us. They deserved our full support. The infamous tractor deal, begun at the behest of our own President (a member of the Council on Foreign Relations) and the subsequent attempt at fulfilling his "unofficial" proposal, by a committee notoriously known for their one world activities, was crushed by the indignation and loud protest of the American people.

J. Robert Oppenheimer, the security risk scientist, the consort of known Communists, an advocate of a one-world government, has turned up in Latin America recently ostensibly to teach our neighbors how to resist communism. Alger Hiss (a member—or former member—of the Council on Foreign Relations) is lecturing in our universities.

The House Un-American Activities Committee is under attack by the one worlders. The Connally reservation is under attack by the one worlders. Free enterprise is under attack by the one worlders. The tragic significance of these things are shocking beyond belief. It is almost impossible to absorb the knowledge that it could be happening in this great country of ours. This desire of a one world is registered in the highest offices in the land. There are organizations crying for a sane nuclear policy, pleading with us, the United States of America, to lay down her atomic weapons and surrender to Russia. This writer has read articles in the public press of recent date with a Ford Foundation byline urging the United States to give up Berlin. The insidious campaign has begun to prepare the American people to accept defeat in Berlin. If the past performance of the Council on Foreign Relations can be considered as a guide, they will again succeed as they did in Korea when Gen. Douglas MacArthur was fired at their direction. MacArthur wanted to win that war and was denied the opportunity. I, and millions of other Americans, are behind the preservation of the United States, and for the free-

dom of our Republic under the greatest Constitution ever devised by mortal man. We want our representatives to obey the Constitution and the country to be governed by that Constitution, and not by Presidential order.

This is a lengthy letter and turgid with criticism. Its purpose is twofold: to let you know that the people are indeed aware of what is happening. And, secondly, to let you know what the people would like to see done in Washington. Never before has it been my experience to see men in the shop (I work as a drill press operator) gather at breaktime and lunch period to discuss things political. The people I talk with for the most part have little faith in the Kennedy administration (on the other hand, they had small faith in Eisenhower's administration), and especially in the State Department. Remember, too, these are union men and traditionally support candidates of the Democratic Party. The time has come when a man cannot be known by his label—only by his actions.

All the weaponry in the world will not save us unless our leaders have the will to use them. The will in Washington is soft. It is more than soft, it is flabby. It is like the underside of a fish, flacid and weak, vulnerable to the first thrust. There is not the slightest doubt in my mind that the majority of our elected officials are honest, sincere, representatives. By the same token, it is agonizingly apparent that most of the key positions in our Government are held by members of, or proponents of, the Council on Foreign Relations, i.e., in sympathy with a world federation. If a solid bloc of patriotic representatives would go before a nationwide audience via the press and television with the avowed purpose of exposing the one world group existing in Washington and promising to return America to the principles of the Constitution, cheers of exultation would sweep the country.

Among other things, the United States should do: Castro's government must be toppled at all costs, by force of arms if necessary. For the self-preservation of this country, it is imperative that Russian influence be forbidden in this hemisphere.

The B-70 bomber should be in the air right now. The United States should have a bomber fleet of decisive power aloft 24 hours a day, and the Russians should be informed of this fact. We should have our missiles aimed at the vitals of Russia, and they should be informed of this also. Every effort should be made to advance our space program. We should resume nuclear testing but very discriminately, bearing in mind the awesome effects of atomic radiation. From a position of invincible strength, we should dispense an incessant torrent of our peaceful intentions to all nations. We must inform the peoples of the world that we are a sovereign, successful nation with the greatest freedom and greatest opportunity of any nation ever established. If America's greatness was extolled because of our free enterprise system with half the energy exhibited by the Communist exhorting their ideology, there would be no contest.

We must not denounce or turn our backs upon nations because their governments are different from ours. Most of the world is not culturally, or temperamentally, or economically prepared to adopt our system of government. Let's help and be friends to those countries who are on our side regardless of their political systems with the single exception of those nations infected with Marxist communism which is committed to the cause of world government. We must cease the trading of and the sale of any and all supplies, products, and manufactured articles to the Soviets and the Soviet bloc nations. This country now sells precision instruments to Russia (the infamous ball-bearing episode is a case in point). Adlai

Stevenson advanced a plan recently to share any new knowledge obtained from atom testing in the future with the members of the U.N. This is not only folly, sharing our advances and secrets with Russia is suicide.

It is utterly preposterous that our lawmakers acquiesce and subscribe to the foreign aid program that funnels our hard-earned dollars into Soviet bloc nations. No aid whatsoever should be given to the Soviets, and to the Soviet bloc nations. We should give aid to our friends. We should give aid in the form it will be the most appreciated, and in a form that cannot be hurled back at us should the honeymoon end. Obviously, the aid that should be given is food. Our storehouses are bulging in direct contrast to our dwindling gold reserve. Food should be given to our friends, but it should be preceded by advanced publicity in the towns and the cities and the villages, explaining explicitly where the food comes from, why we are able to produce such vast quantities, and that they are receiving the food because they are our friends. The food should be accompanied by actual farmers who grow it, dispensed by them direct to the people. Any nation who rejected such a proposal should receive no aid. We should be selling what America stands for instead of selling America short.

We should support the fight against communism in the film industry and in our universities. We should hear comment from Washington in support of these supremely loyal Americans. We have every right to expect and demand the press to editorialize in favor of free enterprise, to publish the mistakes and defects of our leaders boldly. Too often, left-wing writers monopolize the pages of the press with artfully slanted reporting. Sad but true, a one world sympathizer can get a bigger play in the press than an organization like the American Legion, to wit, Steve Allen and Linus Pauling, with their "better Red than dead" philosophy. We should expect our Supreme Court to perform its duties as Americans and not a one worlders. We should demand that the Supreme Court pass judgment on the Communist Party in the United States and render them bereft of constitutional immunity. The Communist Party should have been identified by the Supreme Court as an enemy of the United States and outlawed at least as far back as the Korean war.

This letter has only scratched the surface of what ails America. The conclusions stated herein are the writer's own and were derived solely from perusal of the public press, radio, and television. I have no friends in politics, no organization or group behind me. But my neighbors and friends are becoming increasingly aware of the debacle facing us unless our foreign policy is drastically changed. I know they are concerned and aware of what is going on because they tell me they are. They have voiced the opinions stated above and are doing so more and more.

Yours for a better and stronger America,
LESTER L. POTER.

Sacrifice Means Action, Not Words

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 31, 1961

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, I voted on Monday, July 31, in favor of the authorization requested by the President permitting him to call up the so-called

Ready Reserves and to extend such tours of active duty as may be necessary, in his judgment, to better prepare us to respond to the Soviet menace posed over Berlin. With some reservations, I shall also vote later this week to give the President the additional \$3.5 billion of defense spending he says is necessary.

Those reservations stem from the fact that we have already seen a considerable increase in defense spending since the Kennedy administration took office, including one increase as recently as 4 weeks ago when a spokesman for the administration said, in effect, "our defense budget is now adequate to meet all contingencies," and from the further fact that there is as yet no evidence whatsoever—outside of a vague promise to submit a balanced budget next year—that this administration understands that U.S. strength depends on more things than mere military might.

If the point of all this is to convince Khrushchev that—this time—we mean business, I hardly think that the Russians are shaking in their boots. Last Monday's resolution states only the bare words necessary to give the President what he wanted, but the accompanying report says, in brave language:

[This] . . . will reaffirm to the nations of the world the dedication of the people of the United States to the cause of peace and freedom.

And, again:

[This] . . . is America's answer to the threat to our survival.

Then, in more matter-of-fact language, the report explains that the resolution "authorizes the President to order to active duty, without their consent, up to 250,000 members of the Ready Reserve." Thus we have the something less-than-voluntary sacrifice of some 250,000 reservists and their families, while, following the example of their leaders, the other 170 million-odd Americans go merrily on their business-as-usual way, catering to their own personal desires and preoccupied with their own, rather than the Nation's security. What is needed is evidence of our total determination to win the cold war—a determination which the American people, in my judgment, yearn to express but cannot express without strong leadership—the course we are following will not make the Berlin crisis any more real to the great majority of Americans than was the so-called police action in Korea—a war that was not a war and one that we could not win.

Certainly, the sacrifices so far demanded by the President's response to Khrushchev's threats are nowhere near as wide nor as equal as they should be. This does not mean that I advocate the declaration of a national emergency, or an immediate tax increase, or anything of the sort for the time being, but I do think that it is urgently necessary for Congress to undertake—by itself if the administration does not cooperate—an immediate review of the various domestic spending programs we have so far passed this year, as well as of those still awaiting our consideration, and that we put them to this test: Do they facilitate the

winning of the cold war? If they do not, they should be put aside for the time being, in favor of a pay-as-we-go preparedness basis, and a determination to preserve not only the form but the historic substance of our Republic which combination will provide the Soviets with much more impressive evidence of our willingness to sacrifice, and of action which—because it involves us all—speaks louder than any words of resolution.

African Odyssey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ANCHER NELSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 1, 1961

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, recently I called to the attention of my colleagues an article written by Mr. Walter K. Mickelson, publisher of the New Ulm Daily Journal, entitled "Ghana Drifts to Red Dictators." One of those accompanying Mr. Mickelson on this African odyssey was Mr. Harold M. Fredrikson, a Minneapolis attorney who collaborated with Mr. Mickelson in writing articles which appear in a booklet entitled "This Is Africa."

I ask that an article entitled "Dictatorship Grows in Ghana," written by Mr. Harold Fredrikson, together with another article written by Mr. Mickelson entitled "Ghana Maintains No Color Bar—Africans Insist Upon Equality," be printed in the RECORD at this point as part of my remarks:

DICTATORSHIP GROWS IN GHANA

(By Harold M. Fredrikson)

ACCRA, GHANA.—Today's answer to the question: Is Ghana a Communist state?—would seem to be: Almost, but not quite. The drift appears inexorable; the timetable short.

"Utter nonsense," one might say, "to come to so damning a conclusion after but 3 days in a country so complex as Ghana."

But the tell-tale signs—a one party system, personal dictatorship, government ownership of land, government domination of labor and of agriculture, the destruction of personal freedoms, a party-sponsored youth movement, attacks upon the churches, loss of independence of the judiciary and of the legal profession, the disappearance of a free press—all of these and more are readily apparent for the inquiring eye to see.

It's a land of 7 million people, possessed of vast mineral resources (bauxite, manganese, gold, diamonds), of productive lands and forests (large producer of hardwood lumber, and the world's largest producer of cocoa). It is native Africa's most advanced economy and has the most stable currency. And Africa's fiery, most articulate advocate of anti-colonialist, anti-West pan-Africanism is its president, Osagyefo Dr. Kwame Nkrumah.

Ghana today commands an importance out of all proportion to its size. A few years ago Ghana, in relation to Africa, might have been compared to Castro's Cuba telling the Western Hemisphere how to mind its business. Not so with Ghana today.

Historically, Ghana is divided into tribal regions, each possessed of its own language and native king and council. All tribal land,

traditionally, belonged to the "stool" (e.g. the Kingship, as distinct from the King personally), and the tribal council possessed the right to depose a king for "abuse of power."

Nkrumah has made use of both these tribal traditions in consolidating his iron grip on Ghana.

The Congress of the People's Party (with 78 out of 104 seats in the one-chamber parliament) bears a relationship to Ghana comparable to that of the Communist Party to the U.S.S.R.

All organized labor including the medical profession (which functions only as state socialized medicine) is controlled by the Trades Union Congress (TUC).

Some months ago, TUC became an affiliate of the party and is housed in a new government building. Similarly, about a year ago, the farmers' (principally cocoa growers) cooperative societies and the farmers cooperatives bank disappeared and were succeeded, respectively, by the Ghana Farmers Council and National Cooperative Council (both party affiliates) and by the Ghana National Bank (wholly government owned).

Its first mission: To take over five gold mining companies. On March 8, 1961, the Government announced formation of its own state buying agency to "take over the entire business of cocoa buying firms whose licenses are being withdrawn."

Mr. Adamafio, general secretary of the CPP recently stated that the TUC should be renamed "CPP (Industrial Wing)" and the Farmers and Cooperative Councils the "Agricultural and Cooperative Wings of the CPP."

Furthermore, he said, "The Government is only an agent of the CPP; the CPP is Ghana; and Ghana is the CPP. Ghana is determined to achieve her goal of a welfare socialist state."

The CPP has its own newspapers, and effectively controls Ghana's press.

"The Party Is Supreme," scream the in-color front page mastheads of the party's the Ghanaian Times and Evening News.

In dedicating the party's soon-to-be completed training school for party members, Nkrumah had this to say:

"Every one of us will pass through a course in the institute for proper orientation and adjustment."

"All members of the central committee (e.g., that is of the party), all party functionaries, all ministers of state, chairmen of public boards, and other key public officials, must at all times feel conscious of the truth that in ourselves, all of us are nothing except what the party has made us, namely, agents for execution of the party's program."

GHANA MAINTAINS NO COLOR BAR—AFRICANS INSIST UPON EQUALITY

(By Walter K. Mickelson)

ACCRA, GHANA.—While visiting the new handsome American Embassy at Accra, I met the Reverend Harold Ottomoeller, missionary for the Lutheran Synodical conference for Nigeria and Ghana. He headquarters in the eastern edge of Nigeria where he heads up the school system.

He succeeds the Reverend William Schweppe, cousin of Dr. Carl H. Schweppe of Dr. Martin Luther College of New Ulm, and who is now located in northern Rhodesia. Ottomoeller has 500 African (colored) teachers and 8 white teachers under his school management. There are about 17,000 children in his schools; 250 to 300 in high school.

His mission to Accra was to get some land from the government on which to build a Lutheran church. He found the going slow, not because the government was opposed to his church, but because he had no funds to

use in slipping under the table to get faster action.

Ottomoeller says there is much more corruption in Ghana than in Nigeria. He told of an Italian contractor who won the bid to build a number of \$35,000 homes. He collected \$150,000 in bribe money to go to the officials but then skipped the country. His stranded workers decided to build the homes for \$25,000 each and they made money.

An English firm bid on some other houses but the government decided to give the contract to the Russians who probably will build better houses for less and show up the English.

Ottomoeller's brother graduated from Dr. Martin Luther College in New Ulm. Mrs. Herman Brinkman in Truman is his aunt and Henry and Paul Ottomoeller, Truman, are his cousins.

The pastor chuckled when I told him a friend in New Ulm asked me to look up a friend at Calabor, which he said is a suburb of Lagos. Actually, they are 700 miles apart.

Americans just have no concept of the vast distance in Africa. We have already traveled about 5,000 miles in Africa and have seen very little of it. Roads are poor so you almost have to travel by plane. Most of the planes are British or French owned and operated and are pretty good.

One is almost overwhelmed by the black masses encountered everywhere, usually 10 Negroes to 1 white. There is no color bar. The whites and blacks mix everywhere in stores, banks, churches and clubs. Some of the prominent whites have Negro wives and you often see white women eating or drinking with black men.

Bright blue, scarlet red and yellow are the favorite colors the women wear in their wrap around gowns. Girls who can't be over 15 carry their babies on their backs in Indian-style papooses. When women carry heavy burdens they usually balance them on their heads.

Both men and women are fine physical specimens and they marry early. It is not uncommon for a 15-year-old girl to have a baby before she marries.

The Negroes are friendly and curious, but they are as excitable as a flock of turkeys. So far they have been very kind. We try to be polite and tactful and a smile is the same in all languages.

Most of them live in hovels as poor as any you see in Mexico, but not as bad as in India. The names on some stores are amusing, such as "Glory Hallilujah Book Store," or "Going to Heaven" school bus.

They have a smattering of English but prefer to talk their tribal languages. We find they don't like to talk politics.

Money disappears as quickly here as it does in New York or Paris. They love "dash" which is something free—something for nothing. On the whole the Africans remind you of a big group of poor but smiling children who don't know where their next meal is coming from—and care less.

This Is Bull Run Today

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 10, 1961

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, I have already submitted for the RECORD, the first of two articles on Bull Run by Robert D. Byrnes, Washington correspondent for the Hartford Courant. I found

"This Is Bull Run Today" very interesting, and offer part 2 for the RECORD:

THIS IS BULL RUN TODAY—HALLOWED GROUND WHERE CONNECTICUT TROOPS FOUGHT BRAVELY IN A LOST BATTLE

(By Robert D. Byrnes, the Courant's Washington correspondent)

One of the few spots of the Bull Run Battle terrain where it seems certain a visitor today can be sure he is on ground Connecticut troops were a century ago is Braddock Road in Centreville.

Stone gateposts, now almost entirely hidden by shrubbery, show the name of Royal Oaks, and at the end of a long, curved drive is what was once a large and imposing wooden house. The house, said to have been built in 1710, has a long veranda, shaded by two massive oaks, from acorns which are said to have been brought from England. The house, long deserted and uncared for, is now being dismantled, board by board and brick by brick, for reconstruction in another part of Virginia. The land has been zoned for business.

Within the past few months workers at Royal Oaks turned up a bottom from a Connecticut uniform.

Bull Run, for which the Federals named the battle, probably would be called a brook in Connecticut. In the area in which the Connecticut troops saw action, it now appears to be about half as wide as Hartford's Park River east of Broad Street. The bank on the Washington side of Bull Run in most places drops straight down for 20 feet or more, and that also seems to have been the condition in 1861.

The Confederate front extended for 8 miles along the southern bank of Bull Run with the left at Stone Bridge which carried the Warrenton Turnpike across the run. The bridge is still there, though no longer used, and the present Lee Highway goes off to the left where the run goes through a culvert. This is one of the many relocations of roads during the past century that makes retracing of the detailed action difficult.

Both Beauregard and McDowell had planned attacks to roll up the other's left flank, and both had planned to start the action Sunday, July 21. Beauregard's plan was to put his army behind Centreville and cut McDowell off from Washington. McDowell planned a wide sweep to his right, crossing the run some distance above the Stone Bridge, which was guarded by Confederate artillery, and sweep down on Manassas, leaving the Confederates penned between his army and Bull Run. There was a snafu in the Confederate orders, and before Beauregard's right wing moved, McDowell was across the run west of Stone Bridge so the Confederate forces had to shift to their left and extend their line there to keep the flank from being turned.

The Connecticut Brigade was not a part of the main McDowell flanking move and all the accounts seem to be in agreement that it moved from Centreville along the Warrenton Turnpike toward Stone Bridge. The 1st Regiment history says it moved out of Centreville at midnight July 20, on the Warrenton Turnpike and was detached to guard that road, apparently while the main force swung off to the right for the flanking movement. General Tyler's report, dated July 27, 1861, says the brigade moved from Centreville at 2:30 a.m. "to threaten the turnpike bridge on Bull Run."

Various accounts of the battle speak of the weather as hot, a July condition in northern Virginia that hasn't changed in the past century. Family traditions have it that when the sun rose, that Sunday morning, it seemed to hang in the eastern sky as a huge, blood-red disk.

Available records do not indicate what the Connecticut troops did during the remainder

of the night and the early forenoon. In the early hours of daylight units of the two armies were shooting each other near Stone Bridge, but the Connecticut units do not seem to have been involved in this. Beauregard assumed that units of his right wing were already across Bull Run on their way to Centreville where he must have supposed the Federal forces were still waiting. It was not until 9 a.m. that Beauregard got word that the Federal forces had crossed Bull Run about 2 miles to the west of Stone Bridge in great strength and were moving around the Confederate left flank. The Confederates then started rushing reinforcements to their left.

In this concentration of the battle on the Confederate left flank, the Connecticut troops, probably without having been very close to Stone Bridge, left the turnpike and moved to their right, and the reports pick them up after this shift had been made.

About 10 a.m., according to the 1st Regiment history, the troops advanced across Bull Run and formed a line of battle beyond Young's Ranch. Fry's account says: "We followed a gorge or bed of a brook (from the run) and then formed line of battle on open plain." Fry also says General Tyler ordered the band to strike up "Yankee Doodle" while we pressed forward and crossed the run. This seems to be the only reference to music in the battle accounts. Colonel Keyes, in his report, says from 10 a.m. to 4 p.m. his brigade was in constant activity on the field of battle.

Around midday a force of Confederate infantry and cavalry came up on the right of the Connecticut-Maine brigade for what seems to have been the first frontal action for the Connecticut troops. General Tyler's report says "after some severe struggles" the brigade drove the Confederates back until the brigade advance "was arrested by a severe fire of artillery and infantry sheltered in some of the buildings."

At this time the main battle was still going in favor of the Federal forces, but the Confederates were beginning to resist more effectively. It was probably at about the time of the Connecticut engagement that Confederate General Bee was rallying his troops to join the Virginians of General Jackson "standing like a stone wall."

The 3d Connecticut and the 2d Maine were ordered to take the battery that had stopped the Keyes brigade advance. The Keyes report says these two regiments moved to the base of the slope, where they were ordered to lie down and load and then charge up the hill. At the top, Keyes reported, the Confederate fire was "so hot that exposure to it for 5 minutes would have annihilated my whole line." In his postbattle report, Keyes wrote: "The gallantry with which the 2d Maine and 3d Connecticut charged up the hill upon the enemy's artillery and infantry was never, in my opinion, surpassed."

The reports gloss over the retirement, but it took place and the troops took shelter. According to General Tyler, the move was a march by the left flank across an open field until the line was sheltered by the right (south) bank of Bull Run.

Fry quotes General Tyler, in presumed excitement, asking the men, "Can't you take that bayonet at the point of the battery?"

During the engagement, the Connecticut troops apparently moved some distance to their left, though still on the Confederate side of Bull Run, for the next part of the Tyler report has the Keyes brigade preparing to attack a Confederate battery placed on a hill below the point at which the Warrenton Turnpike crosses Bull Run, which is at Stone Bridge.

Confederate battle reports give some indication this battery may have been the artillery section of the 5th Brigade, Virginia Volunteers, commanded by Capt. H. G. Latham.

It was now late afternoon. The turning point in the main battle had just been at 4:40 p.m. Just before that time, the Confederates observed a large body of troops coming toward the field of battle from the southwest. Signalmen reported to Beauregard they believed these were Federal troops from the Shenandoah Valley and Beauregard was ready to order a retreat. But he waited until the last possible minute and just before then, a breeze unfurled a Confederate flag at the head of the advancing column. These fresh troops were too much for the Federals, and they retreated.

Back in the Stone Bridge sector, Tyler's report says the Confederate battery he had been preparing to attack was removed from the hilltop. The Keyes brigade was around the base of the hill and on the point of ascending it when Tyler discovered the Federal troops were in retreat and he was in danger of being cut off. Again, the reports do not detail the retirement.

Fry says the Connecticut troops crossed Bull Run to the northern side, and this may indicate that they marched across Stone Bridge, for Fry is specific that the troops later waded Cub Run. It was a Confederate artillery shot, destroying the Cub Run Bridge and causing a jam around its approaches, that set off the panic that turned the retreat into a rout.

Cub Run is a stream about the same size as Bull Run and about halfway between Bull Run and Centreville. After crossing it, according to Fry, the Connecticut troops "formed a line again and faced to the rear." There they met and repulsed a charge by Confederate cavalry.

Col. R. C. W. Radford, 30th Virginia Cavalry, in his report, says, "I then charged upon them between Cub Run and Bull Run but soon came upon a column of infantry about 5,000 strong, posted on each side of the road in thick woods, supported by a battery of three pieces."

Radford's account does not match Fry's account as far as location is concerned, as the Virginian has the clash between Bull Run and Cub Run, while Fry placed the Connecticut troops across Cub Run. There was some other important Confederate confusion on geography in this area.

Fry credits the Connecticut brigade with being the last of the Federal troops to leave the field at Bull Run, though he doesn't specify exactly what he means by that. The 1st Regiment history says it returned to Centreville, and its former camp "by nightfall."

Fry, in what is probably a classic summary of an army in defeat, reports that at Centreville "it seemed as if we had never been so tired, so disheartened, so thoroughly disgusted with everybody and everything as we were then."

There wasn't even rest at Centreville, for at 10 p.m. the troops got peremptory orders to continue their retreat to Falls Church. They arrived there at 9 a.m. the next day, after a night march. And then it rained, a daylong summer downpour.

As in so many cases where history is reviewed, "ifs" abound on Bull Run, and one of them could have meant greater glory or ignominy for the Connecticut troops. Confederate President Jefferson Davis had arrived at Manassas late on the day of the battle and in an evening conference considered ordering immediate pursuit. This tentative decision was based in part on the report of an officer who claimed he had been as far as Centreville and found it deserted. The immediate pursuit was abandoned when it was discovered the officer had a reputation for not being very accurate and actually had been only as far as Cub Run. The Monday rain not only turned the terrain into mud, but raised Bull Run to depths that would have made at least some of the fords unusable.

"If" the Confederates had pressed the pursuit, would they have come up with the Connecticut troops before they left Centreville? "If" they had, would the Confederates have been pinned between the Connecticut troops and the flooding Bull Run, or would the Connecticut troops have broken and let the Confederates push on toward Washington?

Most of the retreating Federal forces didn't stop at Falls Church but fled all the way to Washington. The Connecticut troops not only stopped there, but, working through the rain on Monday, salvaged much of the equipment that had been abandoned by the other troops.

Contemporary accounts indicate Federal morale was buttressed considerably when the Connecticut regiments later staged a dress parade at Fort Corcoran, a part of the Washington defenses.

The 1st Connecticut came through the battle without having anyone killed. Its losses were eight enlisted men wounded and one officer and eight enlisted men missing. The casualty reports for the rest of the brigade showed: 2d Connecticut, 2 enlisted men killed, 1 officer and 4 enlisted men wounded, and 1 officer and 8 enlisted men missing; 3d Connecticut, 4 enlisted men killed, 1 officer and 12 enlisted men wounded, 18 enlisted men missing; 2d Maine, 13 enlisted men killed, 2 officers and 22 enlisted men wounded, 3 officers and 115 enlisted men missing.

The Connecticut regiments, as 3-month volunteers, were mustered out in the summer, but few of the men left the conflict. Fry said that 500 of the original muster held Army commissions before the war was ended. This number included 3 who became major generals, 4 brigadier generals, and more than 80 field and staff officers. By comparison, Douglas Southall Freeman, in his book "Lee's Lieutenants," counts 42 from the Confederate Army in the battle who became general officers of the Confederate Army during the course of the war.

Public Facility Financing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 1, 1961

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, during the debate on the 1961 omnibus housing bill, I referred frequently to that section of the bill devoted to community facilities, and I pointed out that the measure, as it was before this House, provided 10 times more the amount initially asked for by the administration.

The administration had asked for \$50 million for this purpose and the committee, over the objections of the minority members, saw fit to insert in the bill \$500 million, while at the same time \$150 million was still available, having been previously authorized by the Congress.

Now there is a total of \$650 million available for community facilities projects, and, in my opinion, this constitutes an invasion of private enterprise for in many instances these cities would use their own credit and credit facilities to obtain the necessary funds for various public works projects. This has been the historic right of all communities—

and while I recognize that in some instances Federal assistance is useful and worthwhile, more often than not, cities, counties, and other political subdivisions will now look to the Federal Government for funds for all kinds of purposes.

A recent editorial in the Daily Bond Buyer, Mr. Speaker, sums up clearly some of the abuses that can flow from an uncontrolled extension of this practice of Federal subsidization of purely local matters, and I think it will be of particular interest to many Members of this body, especially those who still cherish the concepts of freedom and free enterprise.

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have reprinted in the RECORD the editorial to which I refer, published in the Daily Bond Buyer on July 24, 1961:

PUBLIC FACILITY FINANCING

An all-embracing housing bill was recently enacted by Congress which really covers the waterfront in its efforts to provide something for everyone. It carries a \$5.6 billion price tag which makes it the most costly housing program in U.S. history.

Aside from its pure housing aspects there are loan and grant programs for urban renewal, parks and recreation, hospitals, small business, public works planning and last, but by no means least from our point of view, public facilities.

The new act increases the borrowing authority for the public facility loan program from \$150 million to \$650 million. Of the new \$500 million authorization, \$50 million is set aside for loans to States or municipalities without regard to population limitations for acquiring, building or improving transportation facilities and equipment.

Loans from the remainder may be made to municipalities or other political subdivisions with populations of under 50,000 at an interest rate of 3½ percent. This represents a substantial change from previous policy.

Aside from increasing the authorization from \$150 million to \$650 million, the interest rate is now substantially lower, the population ceiling is upped from 10,000 to 50,000, and while the original program had been limited to loans for water and sewer systems and gas transmission lines, it could now be used to finance any type of public works.

The original concept, which seems to have been entirely discarded in the new act, was to provide financing for small communities which was not otherwise available at reasonable term. "Reasonable terms" meant an interest rate determined by the Community Facilities Administration.

Less than 6 months ago, on February 1, the CFA reduced this rate to 4½ percent for general obligation bonds and 4½ percent for revenue bonds for loans with 30-year maturities. Prior to this reduction the rates had been 4½ percent for general obligation bonds and 4½ percent for revenue bonds.

On July 1 a single rate of 3½ percent went into effect as a result of the new housing law. This is no longer a reasonable rate but an extremely generous one, a full one-half of 1 percent or more below the recently reduced rate. In fact it permits municipalities to borrow at a cheaper rate than even the Federal Government itself, for Treasury bonds of about 20 years maturity are selling to yield about 3.90 percent at the present time.

Whether Congress realizes it or not it has placed the Government in the municipal bond underwriting business, for better than one-third (34.5 percent) of the dollar volume of municipal bonds issued by communities with a population of less than

50,000 during the first quarter of this year was underwritten at a rate of 3% percent or more.

Most of these issues were probably underwritten by the small local dealer who has spent considerable time and effort in developing a local market for his community's securities.

Since President Kennedy, who is not particularly noted for his conservative leanings, had requested Congress to approve only a \$50 million increase in the community facilities program at the interest rates then in effect, we can only surmise that there must have been some plain and fancy political footwork in the Congress to bring about the much more liberal provisions which were finally enacted.

All reasonable individuals, including investment bankers, would agree that where an essential public facility is needed but cannot be financed through private means then the Federal Government should provide the means in one way or another. But we cannot see how or why the Federal Government, now operating at a substantial deficit, should begin providing capital for municipalities when private capital is available at reasonable terms.

Nation in Need of Reclamation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN E. MOSS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 1, 1961

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, an excellent daily newspaper of Willows, Calif., the Daily Journal, points out editorially in its July 28, 1961, issue that although there assuredly is no room in the current budget for frills, it is to be hoped that Congress will not consider wealth producing reclamation projects in the West in the category of economic superfluities.

The Willows Journal calls attention to the fact that western reclamation areas for the most part do not produce surplus crops, but rather those vital crops that improve the national diet.

The editorial follows:

NATION IN NEED OF RECLAMATION

In view of the Nation's commitment to a substantial buildup of its armed strength and its ideological war against communism, there is assuredly no room in the budget for frills.

It is to be hoped, however, that Congress does not consider as frills wealth-producing reclamation projects such as the Tehama-Colusa Canal, which will irrigate more than 175,000 acres, mostly of dry-farming land, in this area.

If, as an example, a farmer spends money for a new harvester, which will pay for itself over a period of years and increase his income, to boot, then most assuredly he is indulging in no frill by buying it. On the contrary, he is making a wise capital investment in the future of his farming operation.

So is it with irrigation. The Long Canal, as an example, will increase per-acre dollar value of production more than fivefold, according to a highly conservative Reclamation Bureau estimate.

Not only will farmers make repayments on its cost from their increased receipts from irrigation, but also the higher value of crops and of land provide a larger tax base. The entire economy, not only the farmers and the economy of the area, benefits.

James K. Carr, Under Secretary in the Interior who is well known in Glenn County, made this clear in an address to directors of the National Reclamation Society.

"The reclamation program," he said, "was founded on a firm foundation that Western reclamation development was so valuable to the people of the United States that the national taxpayers would carry the interest charges on the investment necessary to develop the West.

"Western reclamation areas, for the most part, do not produce surplus crops and there is no question that crops on Western reclamation projects are those vital crops that improve the national diet.

"They have been islands of stability during periods of recession. They have slowed the migration of our young people to the cities because they make a better living possible on the land.

"More than that, they have stimulated industrial development and manufacturing enterprises . . . which supply the fabricated materials for these huge projects."

The Long Canal and other such wealth-producing reclamation projects are, indeed, capital investments in the future wealth, stability and power of the United States. Unfortunately, however, the Federal budget, unlike a farmer's or businessman's budget, does not differentiate between current expenditures and capital investments. This, perhaps, is partly responsible for the feeling among some Members of Congress that reclamation costs are to be considered in the same category as current expenditures.

Mr. Carr cited figures showing a dangerous lag in reclamation development during the previous administration.

During the 10 years before World War II an average of one-half of 1 percent of the Federal budget was devoted to reclamation development.

During the 8 years of the Eisenhower administration, this was cut to five one-hundredths of 1 percent—only one-tenth as much.

Meanwhile, the Nation's population is increasing by 8,000 persons a day, while agricultural land is being gobbled up at the average rate of 3,000 acres a day by subdivisions, highways and other public works.

To longer delay necessary reclamation projects, such as the Red Bluff diversion dam as a start to the Long Canal, would be short-sighted, misguided economy indeed.

E.F.D.

Opposition to the \$95 Million Electric Power Generating Facilities at Hanford, Wash., Is Now Nationwide

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 24, 1961

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, since the House of Representatives, by a vote of 176-140, deleted from the AEC authorization bill the \$95 million electric power generating plant at Hanford, Wash., my mail contains hundreds of telegrams, editorials, and letters approving the House action. At the same time it is urged that the House should stand firm in its decision.

From Los Angeles comes this expression of support:

It is my sincere desire that you and your colleagues who are alerted to the danger of the Government going into private business

will be able to impress upon other Members of Congress to join you in the mighty stand you took against harnessing the Government's new plutonium reactor at Hanford, Wash.

From Marshall, Tex.:

From all appearances this was another example of Federal expansion in the whole electric power field and this would make the AEC emerge as a new Government power agency.

From Cleveland, Ohio:

We oppose \$95 million project at Hanford, Wash., to produce electric energy for commercial use. We believe this is the domain of private utility industry.

From Chicago, Ill.:

This project adds nothing to technology . . . the power is not needed . . . coal is a vital link in national defense and the industry and its employees would be injured.

From Huntington, W. Va.:

We continue to oppose inclusion of \$95 million for electric facilities at Hanford, Wash., because we believe that the proposed conversion of Hanford to the generation of power would be contrary to the best interest of the coal industry.

The following four editorials are a sample of the many appearing nationwide in opposition to the \$95 million Hanford project:

[From the Rochester (N.Y.) Times-Union, July 19, 1961]

HOUSE SAYS "NO" TO PUBLIC POWER MOVE

Ever since Government power advocates got their big feet in the door under Franklin Roosevelt, electric energy produced by Government agencies has grown from about 5 percent of the national total to about 23 percent.

Growth of public power dropped off somewhat under the Eisenhower administration. But under the New Frontier, the push is on again.

Public power seemed necessary enough a quarter century ago. Private utilities had lagged in extending electricity to rural areas. Rates were high. But times have changed now, and private utilities are meeting growth and price responsibilities.

Fortunately, Congress put the brakes on expanded public power, at least for the moment, in a significant vote the other day. The House rejected, 176 to 140, the Kennedy administration's proposal to convert the plutonium-producing reactor at Hanford, Wash., into a powerplant at a cost of \$95 million.

This move is aimed at putting the Government into the atomic power business for the first time. Its result, in our view, would be to create a dangerous precedent and, at the same time, produce power inefficiently in an area where power needs are being amply met.

In the field of atomic energy, private companies have put \$600 million into research to produce A-power at prices competitive with conventionally produced energy.

The big reason for expanding Government power into new fields in the face of that record seems to be a desire to reduce the role of private power. Wherever that motive is apparent, we hope Congress continues to stamp on it, hard.

[From the Phoenix (Ariz.) Gazette, July 15, 1961]

TURNBACK ON THE TVA PATH

What may be a significant victory for free enterprise, in the currently crucial area of private versus public power, was won Thursday in the U.S. House of Representatives. By

a vote of 176 to 140, the House said "No" to the inclusion of public power generating in the atomic energy program.

The vote itself approved an amendment which eliminated the sum of \$95 million for electric generating facilities at a new nuclear explosives producing reactor at Hanford, Wash. The support for this Republican-offered amendment was bipartisan, including Democrats from several Southern States—an area in which political maneuvers by the Kennedy administration have previously succeeded in breaching conservatism. It is encouraging that this vote has been won, because it may indicate a buildup of congressional opposition to a widespread administration assault on power generation by private corporations.

The Hanford project is but one example of this assault. It is a very good example, however, because it illustrates the devious way in which the public power advocates are exploiting every opportunity. A nuclear plant like the one at Hanford has a defense function which is readily identified with the cold war. It is in the business of supplying atomic weapons. The public power provision was slipped into the authorization measure for a free ride. As Raymond Moley wrote on this page recently, the Kennedy administration is determined to use the cold war threat "to bring American industry and American life generally into the grip of a vast Federal socialism."

Arizona and the whole region of the Southwest is one of the target areas. Arizona Public Service Co., along with other private power firms, is fighting against an Interior Department decision to federalize the transmission of electrical energy from the Colorado River storage project. Every conceivable bid for public and congressional support against the private utilities is being made by the Department and the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation. But the Hanford vote in the House shows that Congress is alert to the tax losses and the bureaucratic encroachment on private business which public power brings.

Not long ago on the Manion Forum, newly elected Republican (and conservative) Senator JOHN TOWNE, of Texas, declared that the Federal Government is guilty of a paternalism that can lead to dictatorship. "We cannot hope to defeat international communism by becoming more and more like the very system that seeks to destroy us," he said.

The steps toward a hopefully benevolent version of that system are frighteningly evident in the New Frontier program. The attempt to spread TVA-style public power into the Western States is part of this socialistic explosion. The private power companies have ample facilities, in production or planned, to provide for present and future requirements—as taxpaying corporations. They must be allowed to do so, or a vast segment of U.S. business will be jeopardized by unfair, tax-free competition under the shadow of a Federal Government seeking to be all powerful.

[From the Williamsport, Pa. Sun-Gazette, July 7, 1961]

TIME TO SAY "No"

Public power advocates are devising a new raid on the pocketbooks of American taxpayers.

In their eagerness to knock out private utility systems and sabotage private enterprise, they have framed two costly proposals they want Congress to enact in its current session.

They are demanding that Uncle Sam add another quarter billion dollars to the tax burdens of all the people for a steam-powered electric generating plant at Hanford, Wash., and transmission lines for distributing the power to be created at the Colorado River storage project.

Each of these undertakings fits into their scheme for a Federal power empire.

There does not appear to be a valid need for either of them so far as national defense or consumer demands for electricity are concerned. Once built, however, they would become competitive with investor-owned power companies.

It is to be remembered in this connection, that private companies are subject to taxation. They pour millions of dollars into the public treasury in Federal, State and local taxes. A Federal power system, on the other hand, pays no taxes and has frequently required concessions and subsidies from the Federal treasury.

Considering how few benefits there are to recommend the Hanford powerplant or the transmission lines, we hope the proposals are rejected and that Congress calls a halt to spending taxpayers' money for no better purpose than to put Government in competition with America's free enterprise system.

[From the Janesville (Wis.) Daily Gazette, July 12, 1961]

NEW PUBLIC POWER GRAB

As the age of electrical power produced by atomic energy gets its start, Government has added a powerful new tool to those of regulation, taxing and direct competition in attempts to cripple private utilities. The issue appears most clearly in the Hanford, Wash., new production reactor, designed to generate enough power for a city of one million population. Congress will act, probably in a matter of days, on funds for construction of the powerplant as part of the 1962 Atomic Energy Commission authorization bill.

For the backers of Government power, whether it is hydro, steam, or atomic, the Hanford proposal provides a new argument. This time it is "national defense." The proposed plant will be dual-purpose, comprising a plutonium and power producing reactor similar to such an outfit said to be in use in Russia now. If atomic disarmament negotiations with Russia should be successful, it is represented that the plutonium producing part could be shut down, and power production continued—but plutonium could be resumed quickly if atomic weapon needs became apparent.

The double purpose argument, of course, completely ignores the fact that if agreement should be reached it would necessarily extend to such potentials for manufacture of plutonium for bombs. The expectation that Russia might agree to permit operation of an atomic energy electrical powerplant capable of fast conversion to weapons materials is silly. Nevertheless, the national defense argument is being advanced.

Public power has always marched in by way of the back door. Originally, flood control projects were the excuse. Hydro-power was a byproduct, to be sold by Federal agencies at low cost. The fact that all taxpayers in the nation contributed to resulting low regional power rates never has made the slightest dent in the thinking of Federal power advocates. In the TVA area, hydro-power at bargain rates ran short so the Government agency began building ordinary steam generating plants.

If Congress gives approval to the Hanford project, it will mean two things—(1) That Government steam generating plants will be extended to areas outside of TVA; and (2) that the Atomic Power Commission will join the Interior Department and the Army engineers as a third Federal agency in the electrical power business.

Meanwhile, reorganization of the Federal Power Commission in Washington is underway, with every indication that expansion of electrical power systems at taxpayer expense is going to be the policy. The REA already has been assigned a new and ex-

panded role in general "rural development" as well as merely a power-supplier.

Opposition to expansion of government power does not mean that private utilities need be regarded as *simon pure*, or that they are above taking advantage of their customers; given the opportunity. Rather, the question is one of private enterprise vs. socialism. The utility serving this area, for example, reported taxes amounting to \$11,730,000 last year, which was twice as much as it paid for fuel to generate electricity, and well in excess of its \$10,926,000 operating income.

Such a tax burden obviously places a private business at a vast disadvantage in competition with tax-financed utilities which pay only token fees, have no problems of raising capital and are not expected to net a profit.

The advantages of government operations go to users in favored regions. Not only are low rates offered citizens, but low rates to industry provide distortions in the employment picture. While most citizens, including those in Wisconsin, furnish the taxes, a relatively few reap the benefits. It is one more field in which government can give or it can take away, and where its role as regulator of taxpaying business is suspect because of its own role as competitor.

Cuban Tension

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER S. BARING

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 1, 1961

Mr. BARING. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to have inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an address by Carlos Todd, editor, Cuban Information Service, Coral Gables, Fla., before the National Association of Manufacturers board of directors, the Drake Hotel, Chicago, Ill., June 8, 1961.

I have read Mr. Todd's address with concern. I do not necessarily subscribe to everything he has said; I do not know the facts as he apparently knows them. I wish I could say that what Mr. Todd has said is not the basis of concern and is not true. Unfortunately, I am very much afraid that such is not the case.

I am not an alarmist, but I am convinced that the American people should have a more realistic understanding of the Cuban situation, which is all too often labeled "tension." I know of no better way of presenting Mr. Todd's remarks to a vast cross section of our population than through the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I hope that everyone on the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD list will read this address and evaluate it according to his individual dictates.

The address follows:

Gentlemen, I am honored twice today. Never has it been my privilege to address such a distinguished audience, composed of the industrial leaders of the United States. And never did I have the opportunity of visiting this great metropolis of the Middle West, an enormous city of enormous resources, which impresses the new visitor with the energy and activity which have made this country great.

When I was asked to speak to you, I was given a great latitude of choice in subject matter. It is my intention to discuss today "Tension in the Caribbean," a theme that has been ever-present in the news for the past 30 months.

I deliberately picked on the misnomer "tension," to show the fallacy that lies in the use of that word when it is applied to the Caribbean situation today.

I am a Cuban citizen, born in Cuba, who has lived most of his adult life in that lovely and unfortunate island. As a political editor of the newspaper Times of Havana, I lived through nearly 2 years of the frightful fiasco that is the so-called Castro revolution—in reality the Communist conquest of Cuba.

I have been witness to the total eradication of all freedoms in Cuba; to the destruction of its wealth and industry by the Red invaders; to the studied dismemberment of the Cuban family; and to the poisoning of the minds of young and old, to the degree where mountainous hatreds have been deliberately instilled into the hearts of a people who were once gay and happy and carefree.

I have seen all this happen before my very eyes; and I cannot dismiss it, as so many people do, with the word "tension." For you hear today about tension in Laos, in Vietnam, in Berlin, and tension in the Caribbean.

It is totally inadequate to say that I speak to you today about tension in the Caribbean, when the so-called tension has become open warfare to the death.

There may be some among you that still believe that the word "war" implies only much shooting and desolation and nothing else. Only very recently, we have had occasion to witness this type of warfare in the ill-fated, abortive invasion attempt by a handful of young Cubans who willingly sacrificed their lives for the cause of freedom.

Nevertheless, that skirmish—for it was no more than that—was only a small armed engagement which served to accentuate the other kind of war, a war that is being waged relentlessly in the Caribbean and in every corner of this earth, the war for public opinion.

That tyrant and superb politician Adolph Hitler wrote in "Mein Kampf" that public opinion "was the mightiest factor of our time." He used it well and used it to the hilt. He has been surpassed and left far behind by Soviet Russia, which adopted some of his methods and added embellishments of her own.

This war—the war of advertising, for that is what propaganda really is—is being fought with tenacity, intelligence, and diligence by international communism.

The immediate and direct result of this type of warfare is what you call tension, under the accepted semantics of the Western World. But it remains war to the death, no matter what you choose to call it. Mao Tse-tung recognized the principle years ago and wrote, "Politics is war without bloodshed. War is politics with bloodshed."

This tension, this war without bloodshed in the Caribbean, dates from the time that Fidel Castro, together with his Communist master, Ernesto (Ché) Guevara, landed in Cuba in December, 1956. From that moment, and throughout the succeeding months, tension increased fearfully within the island of Cuba; but it had not, as yet, reached any appreciable degree outside the country.

Tension in the Caribbean began from that date as it inevitably begins in every single place in the world where the Communists initiate their well tried and successful program of infiltration, subversion, propagandizing, and bribery to secure total power in any area. The Congo, Laos, Viet Nam, Berlin, Cuba—every single focus of tension can be directly attributed to Communist action.

Open bloodless warfare—tension, if you insist in calling it that—intensified and finally burst forth from Cuba with explosive force, immediately after Castro and his Communists came to power on January 1 of 1959.

It became open warfare in the armed sense when the Cuban Communist government attempted an abortive invasion of Panama in April of 1959. It is worthy to note that the invaders were politely returned to Cuba by the Panamanian government. Castro tried again, in August of that year, to invade the Dominican Republic, in an attempt that also died at birth. The seas around the island were containing armed Cuban Communist aggression.

They did not and have not contained the open bloodless warfare, the tension that has spread throughout the countries of South and Central America. It has become impossible to limit that warfare to the Caribbean, to quarantine it, as you would a deadly disease, from the rest of Latin America. It is increasing daily, and it is achieving new victories and faithful adherents in this hemisphere.

It has invaded this country today, and for the last 7 weeks it has become the subject of urgent discussion from the top of the White House down to the home of the humblest citizen who reads newspapers or watches television.

For the origins of this tension, one may begin with the relationship that existed between the United States and the nations of the Caribbean, Central and South America, in the era of Franklin D. Roosevelt. Those relations were at an all-time high; and the political, commercial, and industrial prestige of this country remained unchallenged in the hemisphere. The cordiality between your neighbors to the south and your Government was a strong bond for hemispheric unity.

Curiously enough, the policy of the "good neighbor" became, unconsciously to Latin American nations, the policy of the "good father." An umbrella of protection—real or imaginary, as you wish—did not permit the intrusion of world power politics on the Latin American scene. The peoples of our countries felt, at that time, that the United States was concerned with their welfare, and reacted accordingly.

It was only after World War II, when militant communism began to march inexorably in every single continent in the world, that the Latin American mind began to have serious doubts of American intentions. Aid in enormous quantities went to reconstruct the ruin of Europe; the Asians receive their share of largesse; African countries began to acquire new importance in world politics; and in their comfortable acceptance of a sure thing, the United States did not turn an eye on Latin America. We became poor relations of no consequence.

Further, and more grievous still, the United States, while leaving the Latin American republics to fend for themselves, resigned its position as the pater familias of the hemisphere; and in doing so, effectively relinquished its position of leadership. You were no longer captain of the vessel. You became a mere member of the crew, defaulting all the privileges of the master of the ship.

You refused to assume the responsibility and the risk that had made you the undisputed leader of this hemisphere; and, instead of a former father, you became a rather questionable uncle.

Nothing had been basically changed in the everyday world of diplomacy, business and industry; but there was a subtle difference in the overall picture that we Latin Americans were quick to notice. In the world of human relationships, there is nothing so appalling and insulting as to be considered "safe" by another person. It is an unspoken insult; and the dividing line between toler-

ance and contempt becomes very blurred under the circumstances.

That was the position in which you found yourself when the specter of communism began to haunt the hemisphere; and you frantically tried to buy and hold tinpot dictators in different Latin American countries to protect your holdings against the advance of the Red hordes. In doing so you played right into Communist hands by actions which brought the inevitable reaction to dictatorships; revolutions, and the installment of the so-called "independent governments of the left." The leadership that you had once assumed and kept for so many years continued to slip from your grasp—and in your paralysis of action and with your political blunders, you continued to make matters worse.

For the liberty of action which you once possessed as the hemispheric leader, had now passed out of your hands. You were the leaders no longer; and our peoples began to look upon you with ever-increasing doubts. In 1958, following the innocent theory that making a better Humpty-Dumpty would clear up matters for all concerned, your aid and your confused torpor unleashed the one force in this hemisphere that you had been so earnestly trying to repel: international communism.

Following the insane belief that the creation of "an independent government of the left" in Cuba would show the rest of Latin America the pristine purity of your intentions, you were—to use one of your expressions—conned into believing in and vitally aiding and abetting the rise of Fidel Castro in Cuba.

Not that you were not warned. Your own special Government departments informed your higher authorities of the nature of the hoodlums that run Cuba today before their accession to power. The information and the advice were ignored; and on January 1, 1959, Fidel Castro took over Cuba; and then, Ernesto (Ché) Guevara, of the Argentine and international communism, took over Fidel Castro. Your "independent government of the left" became the first firm foothold of the Soviets and the Red Chinese in this hemisphere and you helped them to do it.

Imagine, then, the feeling that has been rising in Latin America since then. Every day that passed brought new insult and calumny from the Cuban Communists; and the United States, the greatest power on this earth sat back and remained wrapped in silent dignity. "El que calla, otorga," says the Spanish proverb—"He who remains silent, relinquishes"—which is exactly the manner in which your actions were interpreted by the people of Latin America. The great nation of the north was great no more. A small speck on the Caribbean could insult it, confiscate its goods, jail its citizens, arrest its diplomats, snub its ambassador, and get away with it.

Oh, you had your troubles. If you intervened, you would be called bullies and aggressors. If you didn't, then you became the goat of the hemisphere and the world.

The picture of a declining United States, enervated, paralyzed, vacillating, robbed of the ability to act, was a delicious one to be enjoyed. You worried about popularity—about what the other fellow would say—in a world that couldn't care less.

For some Latin Americans, the time had come to take sides. Castro said early in 1959, "You are with the revolution or against it." This has become the cry in all Latin America. "You are with communism or against it." And never forget that people always wish to be on the winning side. So far, you are losing.

The recent fiasco in Cuba has only served to confirm that conviction to Caribbean and other Latin American nations. The harm that has been done by the failure of a small expedition is incalculable; and you now

stand on the threshold of a "Gottterdammerung" in this hemisphere.

For the tension, the open warfare that emanated from little Cuba has grown to monstrous proportions in Latin America, and your own security is being threatened, according to the recent words of President Kennedy.

They have served, if only momentarily, to give pause to the Communist offensive; and they have brought some measure of hope to those people of the Caribbean and the hemisphere, which have always looked to the United States as the paladin of freedom and the shield against Communist aggression and intervention.

For the moment only; for that aggression and intervention has been made perfectly evident in the Caribbean today, with a Cuba invaded and conquered by the evil forces that guide the moves of the men of the Kremlin and Peiping.

The Presidential words did not allay the fact that the defeat of an invasion of Communist Cuba has been a major defeat for this country in the eyes of all Latin America and the world. Condemnation for the American-backed invasion in the United Nations and in many Latin American quarters is not a condemnation for U.S. "intervention" in Cuba and I say intervention between quotation marks. The condemnation comes because, in the eyes of the world, this country lost.

Will Rogers said it in well-chosen words, viewing the American political scene years ago, when he stated, "On the day after election, they do not ask you whether you held a nice, clean campaign. The only question they ask you is: Did you win?"

And that is the only question that was asked silently by the nations of Latin America after the failure of the U.S.-backed, Cuban-manned invasion. Did you win? Nothing else. For nothing else matters.

Consider, gentlemen, that these nations who regarded you as a protector—although they paradoxically screamed intervention just recently—have only to glance at the map of the world to judge you a bad security risk.

Within the short space of 16 years, the Communists have won control over more than 800 million people in 13 countries; and they have advanced from their initial base in Russia to win sensational successes in four continents—including North America. It is incontestable to say at this moment that they are winning that war to the death, the war of tension. And it is perfectly evident that, with the exception of the Cuban skirmish, they have done it without resorting to an all-out shooting war.

Indeed, they have won an armed clash at your very doorstep, which has left the people of this country stunned and aghast at their impotence before the Communist invader.

The world knows that the Communist onslaught on Cuba was not an attack on our little island. It was, as it is, a direct attack by Soviet Russia and Communist China on the United States of America. That you have permitted this attack and acknowledged a small armed victory with impunity—no matter what other considerations must be taken into account by you—has not been lost on Latin Americans.

Weak countries, like people, will forever look to the strong for guidance and help. If the United States is not ready to repel the Communist invader, if it does not lead us Latin Americans in the fight against these forces of evil, why should we act? In fact, how can we act against the armed might of Soviet Russia and its Chinese ally, already firmly entrenched across the straits of Florida?

Be certain that no matter how you act, you will find worldwide criticism hurled at you. You are called imperialists and aggressors without sending a single armed man into Cuba. You will be called much worse if you do. The Communists will hold a worldwide propaganda feast, and the United States will be served up with an apple in its mouth.

Yet, if you are to survive as a Nation, if you are to keep what little prestige American power still maintains, you must act, and you must act quickly. Otherwise, Khrushchev's words will become tragically prophetic within a very short time: "Your grandchildren will live under Communism." The man means what he says. He intends to see to it that it becomes a reality.

We Latin Americans are accused of being dramatic, passionate, and mercurial in our ways. Underneath that exterior, we are all hard realists. And it is difficult for us, as realists, to understand exactly how you have permitted such open and arrogant Communist intrusion in your own bailiwick, with total impunity for the intruders on our hemispheric and your national security.

It is impossible to deal with the Soviets and the Chinese by conventional methods of modern diplomacy. They operate in exactly the same manner as do your gangsters, who work completely outside human laws and ignore them altogether when it suits their purposes. It is inconceivable that you have not realized, as a nation, that the exact, same methods of Hitler's Germany nearly brought a German victory in Europe for precisely the same reasons. People simply refused to believe that nations could act thus.

It is happening again. But this time the enemy is organized on a worldwide basis and is busily subverting, infiltrating and corrupting the very system that you are called upon to defend . . . and doing it from within your own borders. And you are tacitly permitting him to do so with ghastly unconcern.

Do not believe for one moment that the rest of Latin America is not going to follow in the footsteps of Cuba. The Southern Continent will go entirely Communist; and it will do so very soon, unless you act rapidly to prevent it.

To those of you who still do not believe that a well-organized, aggressive minority can take over a country with frightening ease, let me point to the case of Cuba. And, gentlemen, do not forget that right here, in the United States, a well organized, aggressive minority succeeded in changing your Constitution. Recall the 18th amendment. Recall, please, that a majority of your people bowed to the wishes of a well organized, aggressive minority, which condemned you to years of prohibition.

Meanwhile, the Communists are busy with plans for their Latin American takeover. Czech machineguns are being shipped to Colombian Red elements; and frenzied efforts are being made to unite them into a cohesive and effective force. In Cuba, Castro's guerrilla tutor is training Cubans for the invasion of Venezuela and Panama. The main attack is being directed against Venezuela, where Betancourt's hold becomes more tenuous with every day that passes. Brazil is another danger zone. Only in Peru—where documents of the most incriminating nature were abducted from the Cuban Embassy by Cubans, proving a huge conspiracy against the Peruvian Government—has communism been contained—not defeated.

At the moment, you stand tied hand and foot by the very entangling alliances that George Washington warned against. Whilst Soviet Russia conveniently ignores the United Nations and international treaties when it suits her—and gets away with it—you are ensnared in a web which will eventually smother you to death; and which is now being used with diabolical cleverness to stay your hand in your own defense.

The weapons that you have at hand in the international arena lie forgotten by your former Latin American allies. The Rio

Treaty and the Caracas declaration, which provided the means and the force to cast out communism from this hemisphere, are crumbling into dust.

You are being slowly and inexorably surrounded. Most of Europe is gone. Asia is practically gone. The entire West Coast of Africa, facing the Atlantic, is going. Latin America is about to go.

It does not take much imagination to see the realization of Lenin's dream when he said, "We shall surround the United States. Without having to fire a shot, it will drop into our hands like a ripe fruit."

If this country is to survive, it must accept not only the responsibilities, but also the risks, of power. And it must come to understand one of the basic laws of power: It must be demonstrated or it must be used. Otherwise, power is nonexistent.

As Americans, you are faced with the greatest challenge that history has ever hurled at you. As Americans, you have always been mortal enemies of tyranny and despotism; of mass executions and mass imprisonment; of the concentration camp and the torture chamber; of viciousness and cruelty and oppression. Time and again you have fought against these things; and now you must fight against them once more.

Yesterday, you called these things nazism and you fought them and won. Today these same things are called communism; and again you must fight and win. For if you do not face the issue squarely, you will go down to inevitable defeat, and the entire world will become prey to the forces of evil.

Your forefathers never wavered, never hesitated, never counted the risks, never considered the odds, and they won. You, their descendants, cannot allow this precious heritage to be destroyed.

The fate of the entire world is at stake. You hold too much of the future of mankind to allow it to slip so heartrendingly from your hands.

Adm. Arleigh A. Burke, U.S. Navy, Chief of Naval Operations, a Fine Sailor, an Excellent Leader and Administrator

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 1, 1961

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, a noted philosopher once said:

The body politic is composed of three groups of people; the first group doesn't particularly care what happens; the second is satisfied to watch; but the third and smallest group makes things happen.

Adm. Arleigh Burke ranks high in the third group. Whether on the bridge of a rolling destroyer in the South Pacific, on a flattop in the Philippine sea, or at his desk in the Pentagon, Arleigh Burke surrounds himself with action. He has always made things happen. He is retiring July 31 after 37 years of distinguished naval service, but I am confident that wherever he goes he will continue to make things happen for the good of this country.

Being a Navy man myself, I have closely followed Admiral Burke's career since World War II. The unprecedented progress the Navy has made in all phases of sea warfare during his tenure

as Chief of Naval Operations is a matter of record. The Congress, as well as the American people, are proud of their new Navy, developed and inspired by this great sailor.

The lasting imprint he leaves on our national defense posture under present world conditions can now be fully appreciated. When we realize the vast extent of the oceans and seas of the world, and the many farflung nations of the free world, do we fully realize the value of the Navy's extension of our national power and security. Admiral Burke has seen to it that strong naval forces are properly deployed and on hand in the tension areas of the world. The events of the past few years have shown that he has kept them there ready to respond to the needs of our great country, and to preserve the freedom of the seas and for the commerce of the world.

Admiral Burke has become recognized throughout the country and the world, as the chief spokesman and philosopher for U.S. seapower. Confronted with the paradox with the United States as a maritime people dependent on world resources and world trade to supply its tremendous industrial machine to insure its security, progress and high standard of living but continued to be psychologically a narrow concept of national self-sufficiency, Admiral Burke set his course to close this gap in our national thinking.

Not since Mahan have we had such clear and meaningful pronouncements on the importance of seapower to the economic and military strength of the United States, thanks to Admiral Burke. His speeches, as well as his testimony before committees of Congress, have lighted impressive beacon points of policy which will be kept burning by the dedicated responsible leaders of our Nation and our Navy who follow.

Arleigh Burke is retiring from his beloved U.S. Navy at a most demanding period in our Nation's leadership for freedom. It is a fine tribute to Admiral Burke to say simply, "Well done." Because of what Admiral Burke has accomplished America is well prepared to face with confidence and high hopes the wonderful future, security and progress that lie ahead—based on the freedom of the seas and the skies above maintained by the U.S. Navy for the benefit of all the world's peoples.

ADM. ARLEIGH A. BURKE, U.S. NAVY CHIEF OF NAVAL OPERATIONS

Arleigh A. Burke was born far from the sea in Boulder, Colo. on October 19, 1901. On June 8, 1923, he was graduated from the U.S. Naval Academy, commissioned ensign in the U.S. Navy, and married to Miss Roberta Gorsuch of Washington, D.C.

Throughout his professional career, Arleigh Burke had prepared himself for combat with the enemy having served in battleships, destroyers, and having received the degree of master of science in engineering at the University of Michigan. Then, when World War II came, he found himself, to his great disappointment, in a shore billet at the Naval Gun Factory in Washington, D.C. After persistent effort on his part, he received orders to the South Pacific where, under Admiral Halsey, he successively commanded Destroyer Division 43, Destroyer Division 44, Destroyer Squadron 12, and Destroyer Squadron 23. This latter squadron, known as the "Little Beavers," covered

the initial landings in Bougainville in November 1943, and fought in 22 separate engagements during the next 4 months. During this time, the "Little Beavers" were credited with destroying 1 Japanese cruiser, 9 destroyers, 1 submarine, several smaller ships, and approximately 30 aircraft. Because he pushed his destroyers just under boiler-bursting speed, he became known as "31-Knot Burke."

From destroyer command in the South Pacific, he reported in March of 1944 as Chief of Staff to Commander, Fast Carrier Task Force 58, Adm. Marc Mitscher. While serving with this famed carrier force, Arleigh Burke was promoted to commodore, and participated in all its naval engagements until June 1945 shortly before the surrender of Japan. He flew many combat missions. He was aboard both *Bunker Hill* and *Enterprise* when they were hit by Japanese suicide planes during the Okinawa campaign.

At the outbreak of the Korean war, Adm. Forrest Sherman, then CNO, ordered Admiral Burke to duty as Deputy Chief of Staff to Commander Naval Forces, Far East. From there, he assumed command of Cruiser Division Five, and in July 1951 he was made a member of United Nations Truce Delegation to negotiate with the Communists for a military armistice in Korea. After six months in the truce tents, he returned to the Office of Chief of Naval Operations where he served as Director of Strategic Plans Division until 1954.

In April 1954, he took command of Cruiser Division Six, and in January 1955 assumed command of Destroyer Force Atlantic Fleet in which capacity he served until he succeeded Adm. Robert B. Carney as Chief of Naval Operations in August 1955.

Admiral Burke has received numerous combat awards during his 37 years in the Navy including the Distinguished Service Medal, the Navy Cross, the Legion of Merit, and the Purple Heart. But none are more cherished than two awards which came early in his career. In 1928 while serving aboard the U.S.S. *Procyon*, he was commended for the "rescue of shipwrecked and seafaring men," and in 1939 while serving in his first command, U.S.S. *Mugford*, he was commended when his destroyer won the fleet gunnery trophy with the highest score that had been achieved in many years. His ship also stood third in engineering competition and high in communication competition.

Admiral Burke's current residence is Admiral's House, U.S. Naval Observatory, Washington, D.C.

LIST OF CITATIONS WHICH HAVE BEEN AWARDED ADM. ARLEIGH A. BURKE, U.S. NAVY

For his service in Destroyer Squadron 23, Admiral Burke was awarded the Distinguished Service Medal, the Navy Cross, the Legion of Merit, and is entitled to the Ribbon for, and a facsimile of, the Presidential Unit Citation awarded Destroyer Squadron 23. The citations follow, in part:

Distinguished Service Medal: "For exceptionally meritorious service to the Government of the United States in a duty of great responsibility as commanding officer of a destroyer division and subsequently a destroyer squadron operating against enemy Japanese forces in the South Pacific area from early February to December 1, 1943. Throughout this period, Captain Burke led his forces in many offensive operations. His indomitable fighting spirit and great personal courage contributed directly to the success of our forces in that area and were in keeping with the highest traditions of the U.S. naval service."

Navy Cross: "For extraordinary heroism and distinguished service as the commander of a destroyer squadron operating in the northern Solomon Islands area during the period from midnight October 30 to noon November 2, 1943. [His] squadron, as a part of a task force, participated in the first

bombardment of the Buka-Bonin area and also in the first daylight bombardment of the Shortland area. During the night of November 1-2, a heavier gunned Japanese naval force was met and decisively defeated with the loss to the enemy of one cruiser and four destroyers sunk, and an additional two cruisers and two destroyers damaged. The action contributed much to the success of our operations at Empress Augusta Bay. Thereafter, a heavy air attack by 67 enemy dive bombers was fought off with a total of 17 enemy planes being destroyed."

Legion of Merit (with combat "V"): "For exceptionally meritorious conduct . . . as commander, Destroyer Squadron 23, in action against enemy Japanese forces northwest of the Bismarck Archipelago, at Kavieng, New Ireland, and the Duke of York Island, February 17 to 23, 1944. [He] expertly directed his squadron in destroying two Japanese naval auxiliary vessels, one large cargo ship, a minelayer, four barges and inflicting severe damage on enemy shore installations and subsequently effected a skillful withdrawal without damage to his vessel."

Presidential Unit Citation to Destroyer Squadron 23: "For extraordinary heroism in action against enemy Japanese forces during the Solomon Island campaign, from November 1, 1943 to February 23, 1944. Destroyer Squadron 23 operated in daring defiance of repeated attacks by hostile air groups, closing the enemy's strongly fortified shores to carry out sustained bombardments against Japanese coastal defenses and render effective cover and fire support for the major invasion operations in this area. The brilliant and heroic record achieved by Destroyer Squadron 23 is a distinctive tribute to the valiant fighting spirit of the individual units in this indomitable combat group of each skilled and courageous ship's company."

As Chief of Staff, commander 1st Carrier Task Force, Pacific (Task Force 38), Admiral Burke was awarded a Gold Star in lieu of the second Distinguished Service Medal, the Silver Star Medal, a Gold Star in lieu of the second Legion of Merit, and a letter of commendation, with authorization to wear the Commendation Ribbon. The citations follow, in part:

Gold Star in lieu of second Distinguished Service Medal: "For . . . outstanding service . . . as Chief of Staff to commander, 1st Carrier Task Force, Pacific, during action against enemy Japanese forces in the Pacific war area from December 15, 1944, to May 15, 1945 . . . Commodore Burke was in large measure responsible for the efficient control under combat conditions of the tactical disposition, the operation, the security and the explosive offensive power of his task force in its bold and determined execution of measures designed to force the capitulation of the Japanese Empire . . . throughout the seizure of bases at Iwo Jima and Okinawa, including two carrier strikes on Tokyo, a carrier strike on the Kure Naval Base, and an engagement with the Japanese Fleet on April 7, in which several hostile men-of-war were destroyed by our aircraft. . . ."

Silver Star Medal: "For conspicuous gallantry and intrepidity as Chief of Staff to Commander 1st Carrier Task Force in action against enemy Japanese forces in the Pacific War Area, May 11, 1945. When the flagship on which he was embarked was hit by two enemy suicide dive bombers, Commodore Burke proceeded to a compartment in which personnel were trapped by fire and heavy smoke, and succeeded in evacuating all hands. When the flagship to which he had removed his staff was in turn hit by a suicide plane on May 14, he again arranged for the transfer of his command to a new ship. In spite of all difficulties, he maintained tactical control of the task force throughout, thereby contributing materially to the success of the operations."

Gold Star in lieu of the Second Legion of Merit: "For exceptionally meritorious conduct . . . as Chief of Staff to Commander, Carrier Task Force, Pacific Fleet, from March 27 to October 30, 1944. (He) planned and executed a long series of successful offensive operations in support of the reduction of the other perimeter of Japanese defenses in New Guinea, the Carolines, the Marianas, Halmahera, and the Philippine Islands. Largely as a result of Commodore Burke's superb professional skill, tireless energy and coolness of decision throughout these operations and during repeated air attacks carried out in strength against heavily fortified strongholds in enemy-controlled waters, the Pacific Fleet has been brought within range of the Japanese Empire itself to continue our relentless drive against the enemy."

Letter of Commendation: "For distinguishing himself in action with enemy, while serving as Chief of Staff to Commander, 1st Carrier Task Force, Pacific on May 11, 1945. When the ship in which he was embarked was hit by two enemy aircraft . . . with utter disregard for his personal safety, (he) efficiently organized the evacuation of endangered personnel. His courage together with his prompt and efficient action was responsible for saving these men."

Admiral Burke is also entitled to the Presidential Unit Citation to the U.S.S. *Bunker Hill*, the Presidential Unit Citation to the U.S.S. *Lexington*, and the Navy Unit Commendation to the U.S.S. *Enterprise*. Those vessels were, at various times during his period of service, flagships of the fast carrier task forces in the Pacific.

From September 1950 until May 1951, he served as Deputy Chief of Staff to commander of U.S. Naval Forces, Far East, and for "exceptionally meritorious conduct (in that capacity) from September 3, 1950, to January 1, 1951 . . ." he was awarded a Gold Star in lieu of the third Legion of Merit. The citation further states:

"Bringing a sound knowledge of naval administration and professional skill to his assigned task, Rear Admiral Burke reorganized the rapidly expanded staff to meet its ever-increasing responsibilities and, through his unusually fine conception of the essentials of modern warfare, materially improved the mutual functioning of the Operations, Plans, and Intelligence Sections of the Staff . . . [and] contributed immeasurably the success of naval operations in the Korean theater . . ."

While serving as commander, Cruiser Division 5, from May to September 1951, and also as a member of the Military Armistice Commission in Korea, Admiral Burke was awarded an oak leaf cluster in lieu of the fourth Legion of Merit, by the Army (Headquarters, U.S. Army Forces, Far East) by General Order No. 5, as follows:

"For exceptionally meritorious conduct in the performance of outstanding services as a delegate with the United Nations Command delegation, United Nations Command (Advance) in Korea, from July 9 to December 5, 1951. Admiral Burke's keen discernment and decisive judgment were of inestimable value in countering enemy intransigence, misrepresentation and evasion with reasoned negotiation, demonstrable truth and conciliatory measures. As adviser to the chief delegate on all phases of the armistice conferences, he proffered timely recommendations for solutions of the varied intricate problems encountered. Through skillful assessment of enemy capabilities, dispositions and vulnerable abilities and brilliant guidance of supporting staff officers (he) significantly furthered progression toward success of the United Nation's first armed bid for world peace."

In addition to the Navy Cross, the Distinguished Service Medal with gold star, the Legion of Merit with two gold stars and

oak leaf cluster (Army), the Silver Star Medal, the Commendation Ribbon, the Purple Heart Medal (for wounds received while serving on board the U.S.S. *Conway* during July 1943), the Presidential Unit Citation Ribbon with three stars, and the Navy Unit Commendation Ribbon, Admiral Burke has the American Defense Service Medal, fleet clasp; the Asiatic-Pacific Campaign Medal with two silver stars and two bronze stars (12 engagements); the American Campaign Medal; World War II Victory Medal; Navy Occupation Service Medal, Europe clasp; the National Defense Service Medal; and the Philippine Liberation Ribbon, Korean Service Medal, and United Nations Service Medal. He also has been awarded the UI Chi Medal and the Presidential Unit Citation from the Republic of Korea.

ADM. ARLEIGH A. BURKE, U.S. NAVY CHRONOLOGICAL TRANSCRIPT OF NAVAL SERVICE

June 1923 to April 1928: U.S.S. *Arizona*.

April 1928 to June 1928: U.S.S. *Procyon*.

June 1928 to September 1928: Fleet base force.

September 1928 to May 1929: U.S.S. *Procyon*.

June 1929 to September 1930: U.S. Naval Academy Postgraduate School, Annapolis, Md. (under instruction).

September 1930 to June 1931: University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich. (under instruction).

June 1931 to May 1932: Navy Yard, Washington, D.C. (under instruction).

June 1932 to April 1933: U.S.S. *Chester*.

April 1933 to September 1934: Base force, U.S. Fleet.

September 1934 to April 1935: Staff, base force, U.S. Fleet.

May 1935 to June 1937: Bureau of Ordnance, Navy Department, Washington, D.C.

June 1937 to June 1939: U.S.S. *Craven* (DD-382) (executive officer).

June 1939 to July 1940: U.S.S. *Mugford* (commanding officer).

August 1940 to January 1943: Navy Yard, Washington, D.C.

February 1943 to May 1943: Destroyer Division 43 (division commander).

May 1943 to August 1943: Destroyer Division 44 (division commander).

August 1943 to October 1943: Destroyer Squadron 12 (squadron commander).

October 1943 to March 1944: Destroyer Squadron 23 (squadron commander).

March 1944 to July 1945: Staff, First Carrier Task Force, Pacific (chief of staff).

July 1945 to October 1945: Headquarters, commander in chief, U.S. Fleet (hqd., special defense section).

October 1945 to February 1946: Bureau of Ordnance, Navy Department, Washington, D.C.

March 1946 to September 1946: Staff, Eighth Fleet (chief of staff and aide).

September 1946 to March 1947: Staff, U.S. Atlantic Fleet (chief of staff and aide).

April 1947 to July 1948: Navy Department, Washington, D.C. (member of general board).

July 1948 to December 1948: U.S.S. *Huntington* (CL-107) (commanding officer).

December 1948 to January 1950: Office of ONO, Navy Department, Washington, D.C.

January 1950 to August 1950: Department of Defense, Research & Development Board, Washington, D.C. (Navy Secretary, R. & D. Board).

September 1950 to May 1951: Naval forces, Far East (deputy chief of staff).

May 1951 to December 1951: Cruiser Division Five (CO) (also delegate, military armistice to arrange armistice between U.N. forces and Communist forces in Korea).

December 1951 to March 1954: Office of ONO, Navy Department, Washington, D.C. director, strategic plans division).

March 1954 to January 1955: Cruiser Division Six (division commander).

January 1955 to June 1955: Commander Destroyer Force, U.S. Atlantic Fleet.

August 1955 to present: Chief of Naval Operations, Navy Department, Washington, D.C.

The Soviet Menace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. RAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 1, 1961

Mr. RAY. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to place in the RECORD the following thoughtful analysis of the Soviet menace, which appeared in the June number of the magazine *The Fifteen Nations*:

ANALYSIS OF THE MENACE

(By Suzanne Labin)

"Where weapons balance, stratagems prevail"

This aphorism of the Chinese military theoretician Sun Tse, born in the fifth century B.C., contains the essence of present Communist tactics. Due to the equilibrium obtained in the nuclear field, the Soviets have shifted their assault to the field of political undermining. Consequently, the decisive front is going to be that of the "War of Brains" and of the "Subversive War."

The tragedy we must get out of as quickly as possible is that of the Western World concentrating on the only war which may never happen, the missiles war, and ignoring the one which is at present being fought and through which the struggle will be decided; I mean the political war. If that aberration is not corrected within the next few years, we have to face the death—and a shameful death—of the Western civilization.

The following are the chief weapons of the political warfare waged by the enemy:

PROPAGANDA

Propaganda of a size and an intensity never seen before in human history, a titanic, multifarious, and unflagging flood, unlimited in its hoax, invading everything from bushes to palaces, direct or stealthy, provoking or insidious, thrilling or paralyzing, but always and everywhere planned and scattered with an extraordinary care.

Western leaders often dismiss Soviet steps by saying, "It is sheer propaganda." They are much mistaken. With the Soviets, it is when propaganda comes in, that things become serious. In the present antagonism between the free world and the Soviet world, the front of propaganda has become more decisive than the military one.

Words are the bullets of the 20th century; a widely spread newspaper is more powerful than 10 aircraft carriers; underdeveloped peoples are more easily caught up by 1 television network than by 20 dams; 10 Communist cells undo the work of 5 regiments; and the Secretary for Information is more important for the defense of the country than the Minister of Defense.

ORGANIZATION

This new and dreadful force is Lenin's main invention. It is an adaptation to the era of the masses of the power of intrigue, the theory of which was formulated by Michiavelli in the era of the princes. It is carried out by bolshevism through the most different channels: about 2 million committees, cells, circles, friendly associations, fronts, trade unions, more or less openly controlled by Moscow, from Greenland to Cape Horn, going through the Empire State Building, the Vatican, and the jungle. Propaganda sows only the seeds, but it is the

organization that spreads the disease and transforms adepts into soldiers.

INFILTRATION

In all the bodies and institutions which play a part in the shaping of political opinions or decisions, the Communists introduce stealthily some of their men who serve them underhandedly. Everywhere throughout the world such media as the press, the television, the radio, publishing houses, cinemas, theaters, chansonniers, schools, universities, parties, unions, ministries, the police, the churches and the army all shelter occult relays of the Soviet. Some of these auxiliaries are the hirelings of the Kremlin; others, who are quite sincere, have been fooled, without even noticing it, by a huge network of professional mind manipulators.

CRYPTO-COMMUNIST ORGANIZATIONS

Infiltration of the free movements is not enough for the Communists; in addition, they set up and colonize numberless parallel organizations calling on people for a thousand sorts of activities—cultural, sporting, artistic, domestic—and controlled under cover by Communist groups so that they act, sometimes unconsciously, in the direction most favorable to Moscow's purposes. The number of these organizations which fool a huge public is reckoned at several thousands throughout the world.

THE POPULAR FRONTS

One of the basic practices of communism is to take advantage of the perils endangering this or the other conquests of great value—liberties, union rights, national independence—in order to induce some of the parties who want in all fairness to ward off the menaces, to conclude an alliance with it. Then it creates committees of so-called union where the Communists immediately strive to bluff, intimidate, plunder, then isolate and if necessary suppress their partners so that behind the common front a single head is emerging: their own.

ORGANIZED JOURNEYS

The Communists have raised to a truly industrial level the visits to their countries of delegates who get mystified and seduced by a huge delusive machinery. The part played by these visits in the spreading of errors and sweetening distortions about the Communist system is considerable. Thus, some of the outstanding Western personalities reported enthusiastic appreciations of Stalin's Russia at a time when we know now the country they toured was crushed under the most abominable tyranny of all times. In spite of that, the huge trade of sugared testimonies on communism is expanding more than ever; especially on Communist China.

THE KNOCKING DOWN OF ANTICOMMUNISTS

One of the primary conditions of the success of a conspiracy is to discredit those who denounce it. Therefore, one of the main tasks of the Communist apparatus of the political warfare is to slander by all possible means the staunch anti-Communists. Alas, this witch hunting by Moscow's inquisitors has succeeded so well that many circles in the free world have been penetrated with the idea that it is wrong to fight systematically totalitarian communism—which, however, does attack freedom in the most systematic manner. Here we find a most serious sign of moral surrender of the free world.

TORRENTS OF WORDS

One hundred and fifty thousand hours per week of radio propaganda in all languages; 200 big propaganda films per year (plus countless small movies); 120 million propaganda books issued every year; 2 billion propaganda pamphlets issued every year; and 20,000 stars sent every year on publicity and propaganda missions all over the world.

VIOLENT MEANS

The war of words is spiced and, if need be, relayed by a whole range of sharper activities such as economic sabotage; violent manifestations; street rioting; guerrilla warfare. Also in semidarkness: kidnappings, murders, poisonings. And, still further, this time in total darkness, sheer gangsterism. Chinese communism has become the chief opium dealer in the world, and this with three objectives: to get money, to compromise people, and to weaken the physical and moral health of the free world.

SPECIAL SCHOOLS

The proof that Communists rely primarily on political warfare is evidenced by the fact that they have established some hundreds of special schools to teach it. They cover a tremendous network, ranging from evening courses to universities where the higher staff of the political warfare are most carefully trained. They systematically teach all the techniques of the manipulation of minds: the art of sophism, of spying, of sabotage, of committee intrigues, of stirring the crowds, and of seducing the elite. Some thousands of pupils of every race on earth spend there, every year, some millions of hours to receive theoretical and practical tuition.

OVERALL VALUATION

This apparatus contains many other gears which it is impossible to display in this short survey. Nor is there enough room either to analyze the whole range of psychological and logomachic means used to circumvent good wills and to mystify minds.

To sum up the situation, we have reckoned that for its whole machinery of propaganda, infiltration, and undermining, the Soviets spend more than \$2 billion every year and use 500,000 overt or covert agents all over the world.

We are confronted with the most colossal apparatus to subjugate public opinion which has ever been created in history. This apparatus, which is an international appendix of the Soviet state apparatus, has become a sui-generis factor of modern events. It does not spring from a vice or a whim of the Soviet leaders; the latter have got to destroy the free world, otherwise freedom will destroy them. And their only weapon to that effect is a colossal political undermining.

But what is still more serious is that, in front of such a titanic propaganda apparatus, the effort put forth by the West in this field is less than one-hundredth of the Soviet attack. Here is the whole tragedy.

We must avoid carefully two dangerous mistakes. The first is to believe that the Communist Party is still keeping anything in common with the doctrine from which its name is derived. Henceforth, communism is nothing else than the Soviet plan; which in its turn is nothing else than a system of totalitarian power, trying to extend its grasp by every possible means. For communism, nowadays, the doctrine is nothing, the committee is all.

The other mistake is to measure the impact of the political warfare of the Soviets according to the strength of the Communist Parties. The machinery of this warfare operates chiefly in non-Communist circles, and its only task is to insure the daily servicing of Moscow's foreign policy. Therefore, it is a grievous illusion to believe that a country is safe because its Communist Party is weak, when the arguments of international policy favorable to the Kremlin are largely echoed in there. Such is, unfortunately, the case in most of the democratic countries.

SUCCESS ALREADY ACHIEVED BY THE SOVIETS THANKS TO THE POLITICAL WAR

In order to realize how wrong it is to think that the Western World must defend itself chiefly through weapons, one has only to note that not one single free world position has been lost because a rocket was missing from

our arsenal. All of them were lost because of lack of foresight in our heads and lack of will in our hearts as regards the political warfare of the Soviets.

From south to north, from east to west, the way to the Kremlin is opened not by sputniks but by committees. Let us quote only the latest examples showing that the political warfare produces territorial and strategic conquests which until now could only be secured by the use of arms.

The overwhelming Soviet expansion following World War II was the result of the concessions of the Allied Powers at Yalta. But such concessions would never have been thinkable if the leaders of these powers had seen in the Soviet regime as hateful a despotism as Hitler's. The very fact that Roosevelt could have believed that Stalin's regime had some kind of relationship with the values the democracies had fought for, amply repaid the Kremlin—in a single day under the Crimean sun—for the billions of roubles it had invested during many decades to spread that illusion.

As to China, it succumbed only because the United States gave it up into the hands of Mao. And they did so because they believed in the huge soporiferous literature scattered all over the world by the crypto-Communists to convince people that Mao was not a Communist but a genuine agrarian reformer.

Let us recall the tremendous part played by propaganda in the failure of the European army. Day after day, crypto delegations would keep on knocking at the doors of parliamentarians to hand them petitions intended to coax or to intimidate them; 15 million threatening or insidious letters were mailed to them. The terrible pressure of this staging, which had no parallel in the history of political conspiracy—a real "Iliad" of Soviet propaganda—brought about a number of hostile votes sufficient to overthrow the majority; the EDC was rejected. This was a turning point in postwar history and a major Soviet victory due only to intensive propaganda.

In the streets of Tokyo there was no Soviet missile, and yet President Eisenhower was driven out of them only by the deeds of a few students groups properly intoxicated and handled. Two-thirds of Laos have slipped into the Soviet camp, while its tutors of the SEATO were counting the missiles, through a cheap pro-Soviet intrigue staked on local ambitions. Iraq, though integrated as it was in the expensive military network of the Baghdad Treaty, was extracted from that treaty and shifted to the philo-soviet camp through an internal upheaval which took place at little cost in the face of all the missiles. Guinea and Ghana are becoming Soviet relays by the will of only a few scores of autochthons who have been placed in the controlling posts and properly shaped by the special schools of the Soviet machinery for \$100,000 without any of the hundred million dollars of missiles being able to prevent it. The Congo crisis was entirely due to Communist propaganda and complicity, displayed at the bush, shop, mess, or drawing room level. In Cuba, at the very foot of the huge launching strips of the American rockets, the Soviets are taking root by a simple and classic political penetration.

There may come a day when the Government of Panama will fall into the hands of some popular liberating national front against Yankee imperialism, a front which will have crystallized in the backrooms of the cafes some 50 teachers, 40 barristers, 30 sergeants, 20 journalists and 10 aboriginal dockers around 5 Communist agents used as seeds, through a purely political operation for the whole of which Moscow will have disbursed hardly \$1 million. On that day, I say, the United States will give up the Panama Canal without firing one missile out of its arsenal of billions of dollars. And that will be the beginning of its end. The

Western World will die like a languid giant, stuffed to the neck with superweapons which will never have been used, under the sting of thousands of political fleas fostered by Moscow. It will die as a victim of the lack of understanding of political war.

Finally, it is necessary to point out that the value of our defense depends upon the results of propaganda even from the military point of view. Indeed, an atomic war is decided within the first quarter of an hour. Now, on the very day the Kremlin is convinced that the Western leaders, tied up by an opinion rendered stubborn and ir-resolute by Soviet propaganda, would hesitate one quarter of an hour to retaliate—on that very day, indeed, the Kremlin may launch an attack.

The saddest point here is that one-hundredth of the money swallowed up by the complex of the missile gap which worries the Americans so much would be sufficient to fill up the far more serious propaganda gap. And this, in its turn, would be enough to reverse the world situation in a few years. Indeed, concerning security, the return of the "dollar for the mind" which allows the enlightening of brains is 1,000 times higher than the return to the "dollar for the steel" which produces only weapons.

**H.R. 8230, the Agricultural Act of 1961,
Is a Boon to Farmers and Urban
Residents**

SPEECH
OF

HON. ALFRED E. SANTANGELO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 27, 1961

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 8230) to improve and protect farm prices and farm income, to adjust supplies of agricultural commodities in line with the requirements therefor, to improve distribution and expand exports of agricultural commodities, to liberalize and extend farm credit services, to protect the interests of consumers, and for other purposes.

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Chairman, I support H.R. 8230, known as the Agricultural Act of 1961. This bill seeks to reduce our tremendous farm surplus and at the same time protects farm prices and income. These programs seek further to improve the distribution of agricultural commodities, to expand exports, and to protect the interests of consumers throughout the country.

As a member of the Appropriations Committee of the House, Subcommittee on Agriculture, I have become familiar with some of the recent developments in agriculture, the tremendous technological improvements in the production of wheat and corn and other food products, the declining income in the face of increased efficiency and the intolerable surpluses in corn and wheat. Every one apparently agrees that the farmer who has nearly tripled his output per man-hour in the past 20 years deserves more for his efficiency than the 60 or 70 cents per hour he is now averaging.

Agriculture is still the most important industry of our country and the main-

stay of our economy. It provides the basic necessities of life, food, and fiber. The farms of our country feed not only the 180 million people of these United States, but serve the needs of additional millions in underdeveloped and poverty stricken countries throughout the world. They accomplish this result with fewer farmers, but with superior technological skill and with improved and expensive machinery. Agriculture provides the basic raw materials which support all segments of business and industry. Reliable estimates indicate that each dollar of wealth taken from the soil generates \$7 of income throughout the country. Certain programs which ostensibly benefit farmers and farms also carry with them tremendous benefits to urban dwellers and residents of suburbia. As consumers we realize that without the produce, the food and the fruits of farms, we in the cities could not feed ourselves very long.

Much criticism has been raised against the price-support program, the payment to farmers for taking out land from production of grains and wheat conditioned on dedicating the retired acreage to soil conservation. The storage costs of wheat and corn during the past several years has carried with it a storm of criticism and a resentment on the part of the taxpayers. There has been so much criticism at this phase that the taxpayer blames the farmers for these costs and desires to terminate the agricultural programs. Those who criticize the price support of corn and wheat and advocate a free economy for the farmer overlook the fact that we subsidize labor in the form of minimum wages, social security, compensation, and disability benefits. They overlook that we subsidize the railroads and the airplane industries with tax concessions and subsidies. They overlook that the maritime industry is aided by the Government with mortgage assistance for construction of the merchant fleet. They overlook the fact that the building industry is subsidized by Government guaranteed loans at low rates of interest.

Furthermore, under a price support system and under the practices of the Commodity Credit Corporation, it would cost more to lend or purchase the surplus crops than it would to pay the farmer for retiring acreage from production. Savings are found in two forms: one, in reduced storage costs, and two, in lower monetary advances for purchases or loans on surplus corn or wheat by the Commodity Credit Corporation to the participating farmers.

It is noteworthy that the high storage charges are paid not actually to the farmers but to warehousemen who are not connected in the main with the agricultural industry.

It is my opinion that we in the cities for our own interests should support this bill. This measure will help our farmers and the agricultural industry upon which we rely so heavily for our food, our fruits, and for our fiber. Food to the consumer is a bargain, despite the various packing processes which the housewife and the consumer demand

and the series of distribution costs which add to the ultimate consumer price, the real cost of food today is cheaper than ever before. Food takes a smaller part of our income than heretofore. Today a factory worker can purchase more food with pay for one hour of labor than he could in years gone by.

An hour's average pay of a factory worker today will buy just about twice as much food as it did in 1929. The cost of food which could be purchased for one hour of factory labor is as follows:

Item	Unit	1947-49 average	1960
White bread.....	Pound.....	9.9	11.3
Round steak.....	do.....	1.6	2.2
Pork chops.....	do.....	1.8	2.7
Sliced bacon.....	do.....	1.9	3.5
Butter.....	do.....	1.7	3.1
Cheese.....	do.....	2.3	3.4
Milk, delivered.....	Quart.....	6.4	8.8
Eggs.....	Dozen.....	1.9	4.0
Oranges.....	do.....	2.9	3.1
Potatoes.....	Pound.....	24.8	31.8

Food that takes an hour's pay of the average industrial worker in this country would require 2 hours in England and Germany, 4 hours in Austria, 4½ hours in France, and more than 5 hours in Italy.

A Russian must work three and a half times as long as an American to get a pound of potatoes, four times as long to get a pound of beef rib roast, eight times as long to get a dozen eggs and nine times as long to get a pound of butter.

America's great plentifulness of food, at low cost, can be traced primarily to the fact that our farmers for 11 consecutive years, 1942-52 inclusive, enjoyed prices at 100 percent of parity or above. Farmers invested their increased earnings in new productive resources and in new methods. This brought about the greatest advance in efficiency ever known to agriculture anywhere in the world.

In America today one farmworker produces enough food and fiber for 26 persons. One hour of farm labor today produces four times as much food and fiber as in 1919-21.

In contrast, the employment of about half of the work force of Russia is required in agriculture to feed that Communist nation, and in most areas of the world the great majority of the population is engaged in agriculture and food still is scarce.

Another reason for supporting this bill is that the general economy would experience a substantial buoyancy by the restoration of rural purchasing power which the legislation seeks to achieve. The greatest underdeveloped markets for the goods produced by factories and labor in the cities now are in rural America. A study by the National Rural Electrification Cooperative Administration showed that the rural communities purchased over \$1 billion worth of electrical appliances during last year. Maintaining the purchasing power of the farmers helps the urban worker, the businessman, and the manufacturer.

I trust that this measure will be approved.

A Respected American Speaks His MindEXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF**HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 1, 1961

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I recently received a letter from a highly respected citizen of southern California who for many years has been a leader in civic affairs and a promoter of sound government on all levels—Federal, State, county, and city.

Mr. James L. Beebe, whom I have personally known for many years, is an outstanding attorney who has voluntarily given many years of his life in helping to solve many of the difficult and complex civic problems in California and the Nation. His letter to me and the statement which he enclosed concerning the present challenging situation which the United States finds itself in and the manner in which we are attempting to solve, or neglecting to solve, some of the problems which vitally affect the present and future security of this nation reveals the concern that most of the people who write to me have about the future of the United States.

I submit herewith Mr. Beebe's letter and statement with the hope that his views and opinions may shock some people into a realization of the present situation of the United States on foreign relations and domestic problems:

JULY 27, 1961.

HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH,
Member of the House of Representatives,
House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR GORDON: I am enclosing to you a memorandum stating my thoughts on some of the war problems we now face.

I was glad to see the firm position that the President took on Berlin Tuesday night. I hope he maintains it.

Our greatest weakness so far in 1961 has been strong talk on Laos and weak action; strong talk on Cuba and disgraceful retreat; a complete surprise in South Korea; fear to resume testing nuclear bombs because of what the neighbors might say, although undoubtedly required for our own safety.

The question that many of us are asking is: Will the United States likewise back down on Berlin by some kind of agreement, notwithstanding the strong statements which were just made? I hope not.

I regret the memorandum is not shorter.

With kindest regards,

Very truly yours,

JAMES L. BEEBE.

STATEMENT OF JAMES L. BEEBE

For the first time in my life I fear the United States of America may not survive. I do not fear war; I fear that we shall go down the drain through subversion and folly. I have talked with a number of men recently and find that they feel the same alarm.

I shall not list here all of our failures—at the conference table, in our ill-conceived policies, and in our apparent misinformation or lack of information.

But look at only a few:

1. Our policy of self-determination in which we have advocated the breakdown of colonial empires, thus bringing into being small nations with no capital, inadequate resources, no training in self-government, and lacking the self-discipline and self-

restraint necessary to slowly accumulate capital and slowly learn the hard lessons of self-government. The inevitable result will be Marxist nations (socialist or Communist) mainly because Marxism promises most immediate advances and does not require the self-discipline and the self-restraint necessary for freedom in life, business, and government. These small nations do and will envy us. They will expect us to support them. Our European friends will continue to be weakened by this movement.

2. Our actual support of Communist governments—in Red Poland, Yugoslavia, etc.—using our wealth to maintain these coercive minority governments in power, governments which repress our friends among their people, and finally at Russia's demand will battle us, if the occasion arises. And we just dedicated a new steelmill in Red Poland, built by our funds.

3. Our subsidization of food sales to Communist governments, relieving them of the full cost, freeing their use of funds for other purposes, and placing the subsidy of communism on the backs of the American taxpayer.

4. Our folly in assisting to destroy Batista and to install Castro, a then known Communist, in Cuba.

5. Suspension of nuclear tests, with no proof the Russians have done so, and continued negotiations we know will be fruitless, while we fail to advance in the science. This seems to be based on some fear of what others might think.

6. Strong talk in Laos and then retreat.

7. The abortive Cuban invasion and the folly of tractors for Cuba. Also continued U.S. support of Cuba financially by trade and through the United Nations. Since I started to write this, Castro has further shown his contempt for us by hijacking a plane. We should demand its surrender at once or go and get it.

8. Our aid in the destruction of Trujillo.

9. The great surprise in Korea, with our policy there apparently still undetermined.

10. Our policy of aiding with large sums so-called neutrals who seldom vote with us in the United Nations; who criticize us often; and who do not hesitate to oppose our policies.

11. Our policy of putting more and more of our destiny in the hands of the United Nations, which will shortly be controlled by countries hating or envying the United States of America, some of which will be dedicated to our destruction.

12. Our criticism of our friends and voting in the U.N. against them.

I do not wonder at Khrushchev's statement that he will bury us. The monument to be erected over the grave should be one to our subversion and folly.

The steady advance of communism has been aided and abetted within the United States of America. Somewhere down the line, where information is prepared and suggestions of U.S. policy made, are spies or Communists or Communist sympathizers or softheaded intelligent people, and probably some of each. But the results have been disastrous over the past 20 years.

The Armed Forces now will not allow a Marine band to appear at a patriotic rally against communism at which will be shown the film "Communism on the Map." That film has been shown twice to overflow audiences at the Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce—conferences sponsored by my committee. More conferences on communism are demanded and will be held.

Never have I seen so much patriotic interest as now exists. We are in war—let us no longer talk of the cold-war. And we win or we do not survive.

Members of the Senate and Congress, of course, know much that I do not about what is going on. But as for me, I believe—

We must quit retreating.

We must take our stand.

We must stop supporting Communist governments in our foreign aid program and our food program.

We must stand by our friends.

We must resume nuclear testing promptly. We must not give the U.N. control over our money and our policies.

We must keep the Connally amendment. We must root out the people in any department who have been responsible for the bad decisions of the past 20 years (the men and women down the line who prepare information or who initially write or revise reports have much control over policy).

We must make our Nation respected and not be too fearful of what the neighbors might say.

Red China must not be admitted to the U.N.

Outer Mongolia must not be recognized. Owen Lattimore was one of the architects of our fatal China policy. And now he appears in Outer Mongolia and the talk of recognition has begun.

This is no partisan matter. Bad decisions have not been limited to one party. I wish the President well. His decisions may mean our survival as a free people or our enslavement. I will support him in all his decisions I believe good. But I cannot be called upon to support, blindly, any President.

We are willing to face war; we are willing to make sacrifices for our safety; but we are fed up with bad, incredibly bad, decisions, and with indecision.

Since I started to draft this letter I heard the President on television last night.

I approve his stand on Berlin; I approve increases in arms and Armed Forces. I do not approve the foreign aid bill, as I believe

(1) Congress must control the purse strings, (2) aid to Communist and to some Socialist nations will aid Khrushchev, Mao and company and not us. Also, I believe we should not undertake big new social programs when we need to concentrate on war in all of its phases. Further, we should critically examine some of the social programs which are greatly abused and weaken us.

JAMES L. BEEBE.

Their Best Hope

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 1, 1961

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, so much attention has been directed to foreign affairs these days that we are tempted to miss the comparison that could be drawn between conditions in the United States and some nations abroad.

On Friday, July 28, the Chicago Tribune had an interesting commentary which is deserving of the attention of the Members of Congress. I submit for the RECORD this editorial entitled "Their Best Hope":

THEIR BEST HOPE

The military junta now established as the Government of South Korea has charged 51 persons with stealing the election which returned former President Syngman Rhee to office for a fourth term on March 15, 1960.

If we may be permitted to suggest a line of defense, it is that the defendants go to trial before Judge John M. Karns, of East St. Louis. Although it may be argued that Korea is off Judge Karns' beat, his jurisdiction has proved to be sufficiently elastic to

bring him to Chicago as acting county judge. In that capacity he found reasons to dismiss vote fraud charges against 677 precinct officials in last November's election.

Judge Karns' compassion might conceivably stretch to accused Korean vote thieves also.

This Is Bull Run Today

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 10, 1961

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, the country watched with interest last weekend the reenactment of one of the major conflicts of this Nation's Civil War of 1861 to 1865. The First Battle of Manassas holds an important place in our history, and I want to congratulate the Virginia authorities, the directors of the spectacle and those devoted historical buffs who engaged in the spectacle.

Bull Run holds a particular place in Connecticut history as well. Robert D. Byrnes, the correspondent of the Hartford Courant with whom many of the Members of Congress are familiar, has taken the occasion of the anniversary to review the part of Connecticut regiments in the action and I found his article exceptionally interesting. I offer the first of these articles for the RECORD:

THIS IS BULL RUN TODAY—PLACID CHARM NOW FILLS THE CIVIL WAR GROUND WHERE CONNECTICUT TROOPS WERE SWEEPED INTO BITTER HISTORY

(By Robert D. Byrnes, the Courant's Washington correspondent)

(Main battlefield, which Connecticut troops never reached, was where Confederate General Jackson won his sobriquet when his Virginians held "like a stone wall.")

Falls Church, Va., today is one of Washington's booming suburbs. It has a population of 10,500 and the chamber of commerce cites such suburban convenience as being only 8 miles from the center of Washington, 20 to 25 minutes by car and 35 minutes by bus from the Nation's capital.

On June 18, 1861, when the 1st Connecticut Volunteers went into camp there, Falls Church was a village, though already one with history going back to the Indian wars and the French and Indian War. The community takes its name from the 1769 church built by the Fairfax Vestry, with George Washington a member of the building committee. The church was named for the Little Falls in the Potomac 5 miles away.

It was on July 16, 1861, a Tuesday, when the Connecticut regiments moved out of Falls Church on their way to Bull Run, the first full-scale engagement of the Civil War.

On July 23, 1861, just 100 years ago today, the Connecticut troops were back at Falls Church. Sunday, July 20, they had sweltered and fought around Bull Run. Monday, in a pouring rain, they had worked all days salvaging equipment in the Falls Church camp that had been abandoned by other troops who had fled all the way into Washington after the rout following the Confederate victory.

To the Connecticut soldiers of a century ago, Falls Church was enemy territory. The official records of the 1st Regiment note that it was "a position peculiarly exposed to attack" and the "rebels" could reach the

rear of the Connecticut position easily from either Ball's Crossroads or Bailey's Crossroads, now also thriving suburban communities. The 3d Connecticut Volunteers moved out to Falls Church on June 24 and the regimental record notes it was "then the extreme and much exposed outpost of the Union lines."

Bull Run was close enough to Washington even 100 years ago so many Members of Congress and other Washington citizens drove out to see the battle—and added greatly to the turmoil when they fled as the Union troops (but not the Connecticut regiments) broke and ran back to Washington. The distances today, with automobiles and good roads, are even shorter, relatively. Highway engineers and developers, with bulldozers, cottages and ramblers, and suburban shopping centers have changed much of the landscape so it would be unrecognizable today to the men who marched across it in 1861.

Falls Church sources say the Union campsite was in the area that is now the Seven Corners shopping center, and the center of it probably was where the suburban branch of a Washington specialty store now stands. Driving over the terrain of the Bull Run campaign, walking through some parts of it, consulting reference works and checking with northern Virginia residents whose families lived in the area at the time of the battle, produces very little that can be pinpointed today as the place where a Connecticut regiment marched or fought.

The official military reports of both Union and Confederate commanders in the library of the National Park Service headquarters at the Manassas battlefield are helpful in many respects. In others they are frustrating, for the authors went into detail only on their advances, in most cases, and said little or nothing about retirements.

The troops on the way to Bull Run probably weren't much interested in landmarks or topographic features at the time, though coming back they learned a lot about the two major streams, Bull Run and Cob Run, which they had to wade. The attitude on the advance, as expressed by a Connecticut veteran who wrote under what seems to have been the pseudonym of "Frinkle Fry," in a book published in Hartford in 1872 was:

"After whipping the rebels we were to take the cars at Manassas and proceed to Richmond which we were to take early the next morning before sunrise."

This spirit of finishing the job in a hurry, with everybody playing a star role, was much in evidence as the war started.

Connecticut had been allotted only one regiment in President Lincoln's first call or 75,000 3-month volunteers, but because Gov. William A. Buckingham was a personal friend of Lincoln, according to a contemporary account, the State was permitted to raise three regiments for the first contingent.

There were problems, even before the battles started. Col. John Arnold, commander of the 3d Volunteers, resigned, and Governor Buckingham appointed Lt. Col. John L. Chatfield, of Waterbury, who was in the 1st Regiment, as colonel of the 3d. Lt. Col. Allen G. Brady, of Torrington, second in command of the 3d, considered Chatfield's promotion over his head from another regiment a violation of militia regulations and refused to recognize Chatfield as commander of the regiment. Brady was "deprived of his sword" at the time, but later served with distinction.

The 1st Regiment went into service under command of Col. Daniel Tyler of Norwich, a West Point graduate in 1819. Company A was from Hartford and was commanded by Capt. George S. Burnham, with 1st Lt. Joseph R. Hawley second in command. Tyler was promoted to brigadier general on May 10, 1861, the day the regiment sailed from New Haven for the 3-day voyage to Wash-

ington. Burnham was promoted to colonel and given command of the regiment, and Hawley advanced to captain, in command of Company A.

The 2d Regiment was commanded by Col. Alfred H. Terry of New Haven, with David Young of Norwich as lieutenant colonel, and Ledyard Colburn of Derby as major. The 3d Regiment seems to have been the last of the first contingent to be organized and the official State records say it went into camp at the Albany Avenue Fairgrounds in Hartford, May 9.

The 1st Regiment reached Washington, May 13. After about 2 weeks in camp in the Glenwood section of Washington, the 1st marched across the Potomac on June 1 as the Union forces moved to secure the Virginia side of the river opposite Washington. The march was over the Long Bridge, site of the present 14th Street bridges, near the Washington Monument.

The 1st must have moved through or past the plantation of Robert E. Lee, now Arlington National Cemetery, to reach Roach's Mills on what was then the Alexandria & Leesburg Railroad, where it encamped.

The railroad provided some mobility but the use of it brought the 1st into the shooting war for the first time. On June 16, a train that had been used for a reconnaissance trip was ambushed by Confederates at Vienna and George H. Bugbee of Company A was severely wounded. Except for Maj. Theodore Winship, who had been killed in the Battle of Big Bethel, near Newport News, 7 days earlier, Bugbee's was the first Connecticut blood shed in battle during the war.

According to Fry, the man who shot Bugbee was identified after the war as Frank Williams, who had a wartime career of his own in the Confederate Cavalry under Mosby.

The 1st moved from Roach's Mills to Falls Church on June 18. On the next day it was joined there by the 2d Regiment. The 3d Regiment and the 2d Maine, the latter in gray uniforms which caused permanent embarrassment to a Confederate officer who rode into their midst during the Bull Run Battle, also moved into camp at Falls Church and the four regiments became the 1st Brigade under Col. Erasmus D. Keyes.

Movement of the Federal troops across the Potomac into northern Virginia served several purposes, one of which was to keep the Confederates from possessing Arlington Heights, from which they could look down into Washington. Another was to appease the public clamor in the north for action and "on to Richmond."

On the Virginia side, the Confederates built up their forces for defense of their northern frontier. In command was Gen. Pierre G. T. Beauregard, "Old Bory" to his soldiers who had been in command at the bloodless Confederate victory at Fort Sumter. Beauregard, in a June 5 proclamation to the people, told them "a restless and unprincipled tyrant has invaded our soil" and "all rules of civilized warfare are abandoned and they proclaim by their acts, if not on their banners, that the war cry is 'Beauty and booty.'"

The Civil War was the first major conflict in which railroads were an important military consideration. One of the railroads ran from Richmond to the Shenandoah Valley, where there was another Confederate army. A junction point on this railroad was Manassas, whose name the Confederates gave to the two battles, and where Beauregard had his headquarters. Today Manassas has the appearance of a community where nothing exciting ever happens, with some of the buildings in the small business center looking as if they may well have been standing when Beauregard came there.

Manassas was well situated with rail connections to Richmond and the South, and to

the Confederate Army under Gen. Joseph E. Johnston which had been at Harpers Ferry, as the jumpingoff point for an attack, for which Beauregard planned, that would capture Washington and end the war. Manassas was equally advantageous to the Federals, for its capture would cut Johnston off from Richmond and open the way to "take the cars" for the Confederate capital and the end of the war.

On July 16, the Federal forces moved out of Falls Church. The three Connecticut regiments, with the Maine infantry, constituted the First Brigade of the First Division. The Norwich West Pointer, General Tyler, commanded the division. The First Brigade led the way, with the First Connecticut covering the left of the head of the column and the Second Connecticut the right. The first day's march took them to Vienna, about half a dozen miles from Falls Church. The next day they made another dozen miles. On July 18 they arrived at Centreville and camped there.

Coming into Centreville, the Federal troops were on the Warrenton Turnpike. Today the former Warrenton Turnpike is Lee Highway, named for the Confederate general, and some of it is a modern four-lane divided road. Centreville is so named because five roads come together there. One of these is Braddock Road, named for the British general who passed that way on his ill-fated march to the West before the Revolution in company with the then young Virginian, George Washington.

Dan Patch Record Still Stands

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANCHER NELSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 1, 1961

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, this weekend I was happy to attend the Dan Patch Days celebration in Savage, Minn. Home of the fastest racing pacer in history, the city of Savage is a booming area contributing a great deal to the economy of Minnesota. Because of its growing importance to the North Star State, I ask to have made a part of my remarks in the RECORD a brief history of this city, reported in the July 27 issue of the Dakota County Tribune:

NEW INDUSTRIES AND DAN PATCH FAME SPARKED SAVAGE GROWTH

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Dan Patch Days at Savage, an annual event, will be held on July 28, 29, and 30 this year. This festival is sponsored by the Dan Patch Days, Inc., a group of civic minded gentlemen from Savage. Dan Patch Days again will feature a queen to be crowned Saturday night and a huge parade, Sunday noon. Queens are listed elsewhere.)

DAN PATCH DAYS PROGRAM

Friday night, July 28: Carnival.

Saturday, July 29: Carnival and kiddie parade and contest at 1 p.m.; Bowles dancing troupe, 8 p.m.; queen crowning, 8:30 p.m.; kiddie matinee from 1 to 5 p.m.; dancing at 9 p.m., with Jolly Musicians orchestra.

Sunday, July 30: Carnival and grand parade at 1 p.m. Prize drawings at 4 p.m.

Dan Patch Days Inc., are composed of members from the volunteer fire department, VFW Warren Butler Post 6212; Savage Lions Club; American Legion; Dan Patch Post 643, of Savage.

Committees for Dan Patch Days have previously been mentioned. A complete booklet with all information has been printed and distributed.

Although Savage has grown into a little giant of industry, featuring much machinery with horsepower of steam, gasoline, and electricity, the celebration each year in July at Savage, features the one-horse power of the historic Dan Patch, a racing pacer, who set the fastest record of 1:55 for a mile, back in 1906. No horse has beat this record to date.

Dan Patch was owned by W. M. Savage, who trained the famous horse at Savage on the only enclosed racing track of a half mile in the world.

The little village of Hamilton, on the Minnesota River bank, located just out of the Burnsville, Dakota County borders, in Scott County, in 1904, changed its name to Savage in honor of Mr. Savage, owner of the famous horse.

Dan Patch was not only the pride and joy of Mr. Savage, who paid \$60,000 for him, but he was the idol of every horse lover in the Nation.

Horsing was the top sport in the early part of the century and a picture of Dan Patch appeared in every feed store, blacksmith shop, livery stable, public meeting hall, and many general stores throughout the country. Every young boy's ambition was to see Dan Patch race. He was the main attraction at the Minnesota State Fair and other racing expeditions in the Nation.

Mr. Savage added another honor to his horse a few years before his death, when Savage built a gasoline-powered railroad from Minneapolis to Northfield and Randolph and named it the Dan Patch. It is now the Minneapolis, Northfield & Southern Railway.

In 1916 Dan Patch died and his master died 36 hours later. The horse is buried in an unmarked grave at Savage and his master rests in Minneapolis. A year later, the big barn and covered track burned. Then the whole community lapsed into quietness.

In 1928 a syndicate built a dog racing track at the old Savage race track. That venture was short lived because authorities claimed it conflicted with the Minnesota antigambling laws. This property was wrecked in 1938.

About 1940 the new Highway 13 was relocated through the village of Savage and things were beginning to look up again.

About 1942 the operators of the present Savage Tool Co., came quietly to town, and bought a site and established a large plant.

Next Cargill, Inc., came to Savage and bought a part of the Ed Hanson farm, which included some of the old W. M. Savage farm, on the Minnesota River bank. Cargill built a shipyard there and work was begun dredging a 9-foot channel in the Minnesota River, making it ready to launch seagoing vessels. Savage was designated by the WPB for the rail-river-ore transfer.

Ed Hanson, the man who sold Cargill the property which started the boom, was the former trainer of Dan Patch. For many years he farmed and Savage traded horses in the northwest.

Today an airplane visitor over Savage, little giant of industry, will pass over the skyscraper towers of Cargill, Inc., and Continental Grain; then at the entrance to the Cargill base is the new long building for the Producers Container Co., which turns out 2½ million cans for Green Giant Co. at Le Sueur, that was finished in 1958.

The tool company which is Continental Machines, Inc., located in the downtown business area, employs between 500 and 1,000 men and women, since 1946.

Southwest of there is the Richards Oil Refinery, which came there in the mid

1950's; also the Continental Grain, whose storage bins were built in 1960.

Behind a row of trees is located the Master Specialty Co., whose owner is Harold Petsch of Prior Lake. Here a dozen employees turn out plastic mops, brooms, car carriers, rotary hedge trimmers, and so forth. Harold's factory has a branch in Stuttgart, Germany.

In an old garage, Ralph Stroud and Joe Kottom own and operate Stroud Manufacturing Co. They make scales for weighing gun power, used by sportsmen, which are accurate to one-tenth of a grain.

The latest industry is a cement works built by Crow & Crow, similar to that at Rosemount.

However great the boom at Savage, the ghost of the great Dan Patch of the past is prominent at Savage:

Large letters on the water tower spell "Savage—Home of Dan Patch." Then there is the Dan Patch Bowling Lanes; Dan Patch Cocktail Lounge; Dan Patch Apartments (once the Budweiser Club of the 1930's known as Little Reno, when the slot machine had its day).

A man named "Dan Patch" who works at Continental Machines, has a sign on his garage, "Home of Dan Patch."

Oldtimers like to take out time and discuss memories of Dan Patch. Bob Allen and Ben Morlock are among the few who can point out the horse's burial spot. Ed Hanson's son can tell some of his father's experiences as Dan Patch's trainer. Ben Morlock, justice of the peace, is an antique collector, especially of Dan Patch lore which includes, the horse's nickel-plated feed box and a cutter he used to haul in winter.

The home of Harry Hersey still stands. He was the driver of Dan Patch on Sept. 8, 1906, before 90,000 people at the Minnesota State Fair, when the horse set the world's fastest pacing record of 1:55 for a mile.

It is often wondered why Mr. Savage chose this location to train horses. He also had other racing horses besides Dan Patch. The answer is simple. It is because the spongy bottom-land ground along the river was ideal for horses.

Another question asked many times is, Why has this quiet little river town become a boom town? The answer is also obvious.

This location is ideal for transportation with two paved highways, Nos. 13 and 101, at its boundary, the Omaha Railroad, and the Minnesota River traffic; a low tax compared to the Twin City taxes; the ease with which workers may come and go.

In recent years, many housing projects in Savage and bordering the village, have developed. Several apartment houses are being built to help take care of the increased population. New modern schools, the Savage-Burnsville system, is one of the largest and most up to date in the country. This school is largely supported by the taxes from Northern States Power Co.'s Blackdog plant in Burnsville.

There is no telling how much more industry will come to Savage, but regardless, the ghost horse will always ride through the village and Dan Patch will always be their mascot.

Recently Savage has added to its business district a doctor, dentist, attorney, a bank, a newspaper, a surveyor, a bowling alley, a variety store, a wash and dry establishment; a service center (utilities) and a new Standard station; truckstop cafe. A shopping center in the village and one bordering the village are being planned.

Village officers at Savage are:

Mayor, Mark Egan; village clerk, John Bergman; trustees, Cliff LeVillie, Merle Madson, Cleve Eno; treasurer, Virginia Emerson.

This area has perhaps made the biggest progress of any in the last 150 years, when the Sioux Indians paddled their canoes up

and down the river which was then lined with forest and swampland. The first sign of progress came when the Savage community's first steam locomotive was brought by flat boat in the late 1860's and set upon the rails of the St. Paul & Sioux City Railway; then made its maiden run from Savage.

Labor Bosses in the Role of Management

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ALFRED E. SANTANGELO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 1, 1961

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Speaker, a person cannot serve two masters. The conflict of interest is such that despite the good intentions, the vying factors create a situation which the most honest man can hardly resolve. In Government, when public officials act in a manner which is contrary to their public duty, the moral condemnation of the public is sufficient to oust the official from power. The problem of the conflict of interest is being considered by the Congress and there is no problem which gives legislators greater concern. Codes of ethics in the law, in Government, and in business frown upon a duality of position. Labor representatives cannot act for management because they may be disposed to fail in their obligations to their membership.

A few years ago, because an industry was about to fail, a union decided that it would act in a dual capacity as a representative of labor and as management.

It felt that by disclosing its dual activities that it could operate successfully and defy the biblical mandate that a person cannot serve two masters. Recent developments indicate the truth of the biblical mandate that no matter how sincere the intentions, the conflict creates insurmountable obstacles.

An editorial by Richard A. Lewis in the Wall Street Journal of August 1 sets forth the efforts of a union to act in a dual capacity of representative of labor and manager of a firm. Criticism has been raised and I believe that the article by Richard Lewis is informative and demonstrates that a union cannot successfully wear two hats—the hat of labor and the hat of management. The article follows:

LABOR BOSSES—UNION-RUN HAT FIRM LIFTS SALES BUT STIRS WRATH OF ITS RIVALS—COMPETITORS HIT LOW PAY, SAY UNION USES ITS POWER TO PUT PRESSURE ON BUYERS—AN ANTI-IMPORT DRIVE GAINS

(By Richard A. Lewis)

NEW YORK.—Can a union successfully wear two hats—functioning in its traditional role as spokesman and bargaining agent for its members and also taking a part in management decisions on production, wages, and other matters affecting not only union members but the general public?

For years, Walter Reuther and other articulate labor leaders have argued that such a union voice in corporate management is an unqualified necessity. Only in this way, they contend, can companies avoid costly "mistakes" which endanger workers' incomes and job security.

While Mr. Reuther has been making speeches on this controversial topic, one union, acting on its own, has actually made the big leap to the corporate directors' table. It is the AFL-CIO United Hatters, Cap & Millinery Workers International Union. Because of some of its managerial activities, it may be worthwhile to examine in some detail the hatters' operations.

A POT OF MONEY

There are other reasons why the Hatters are worthy of attention. The union has achieved such dominance in its industry, critics charge, that it probably has more to say about what a woman will put on her head than such famous firms as Hattie Carnegie, Lilly Dache, Sally Victor and Mr. John. Standing out like a giant among the 700 generally pigmy-size manufacturers, in the women's hat field, it lends money to some of the employers it bargains with and serves as a landlord to others. The union's \$11 million welfare and retirement fund is described by one manufacturer as "the only pot of money in the industry."

As a representative of workers, the Hatters' union collects dues from about 95 percent of the Nation's 20,000 millinery employees; another 20,000 of its members work in plants turning out men's hats, caps and hat bodies. As a capitalist, the union collects dividends on 60 percent of the stock of Merrimac Hat Co. of Amesbury, Mass., the Nation's largest producer of fur felt bodies, from which women's hats are made. Six top union officials also sit on Merrimac's nine-man board; Alex Rose, president of the International and a power in New York State's Liberal Party, is a chairman of the board and Gerald R. Coleman, the union's executive secretary, doubles as Merrimac treasurer.

If you were to form a judgment from its press clippings alone, the union's venture into corporate management has been a sparkling success. "What really distinguishes this union is its broad-angle vision of its responsibilities," declared the Reader's Digest in a 1959 article reprinted from American Business magazine. "Industrial statesmanship" and "union pioneer" are other descriptive terms applied to the Hatters' Merrimac venture. Victor Relsel, the nationally syndicated columnist, calls it "a do-it-yourself prosperity formula without the use of Government money."

PRIVATE ENTERPRISE PLUS

Union President Rose, himself, calls Merrimac "an example of private enterprise plus." Early in 1959 the union moved in with \$300,000, helped reorganize the company and bought 6,000 shares of its 10,000-share capitalization. The foundering firm's facilities had been shut down for several months and its 250 workers had almost lost hope of further employment at the plant. Today, employment at Merrimac is heading for an expected 12-year high of 350 workers as the fall seasonal hat production peak approaches.

Production at Merrimac is running at the fastest clip in more than a decade. Sales last year rose to \$2,216,987, up 37 percent from the last year under nonunion control; and Hans Rie, the Austrian-born president of the company, who was retained from the previous management, reports this year's volume is running "at least 25 percent ahead of 1960." Merrimac, moreover, has paid regular dividends in each of the past 2 years and the union already has thus received a \$24,000 return on its original investment.

Despite this glowing record, there has been an increasing rumble of complaint lately here and there throughout the hat industry about the means the union allegedly has used to write its success story. Like many an old-time capitalist, the union has been accused of keeping wages too low in its own plant. And like some more modern corporate bosses, it's also being accused of that current affliction, conflict of interest.

FIGHTING IMPORT COMPETITION

The alleged conflict is not the usual one, for most hat makers concede the union is doing a good job for Merrimac. Instead, they complain the union bosses are taking their new role as entrepreneurs in the hat body business so seriously that they are aggressively using their union power to try to snuff out the principal competing source of these materials—imports from Europe. Milliners purchase hat bodies, block them into various shapes and then bedeck them with flowers, feathers, or ribbons to turn them into the fancy creations that women buy.

One manufacturer says he came into his shop one morning during the busiest part of last fall's season to find none of his blockers had shown up for work. Blockers are the skilled workers who shape the hat bodies into finished form. The manufacturer says it was made clear to him that the blockers were not supposed to handle imported hat bodies. The hat maker immediately picked up his phone and placed a large order with Merrimac; by 1 p.m., he says, his blockers were back at work—working on the imported hat bodies that had been forbidden in the morning.

"Before the union bought that factory, it wouldn't have cared if you had bought your hat bodies from a Chinaman," snorts another angry hatter. "Now they've become quasi-managers, interested in their investment from management's point of view."

The union makes no attempt to conceal its campaign against imports. But it insists it is doing so out of concern for hat workers' health which it says can be damaged by the mercury sometimes used to treat fur used in foreign hat bodies. Another declared motive in the union anti-import campaign is to "save" the American hat body industry.

In a plea for higher tariffs on imported goods before the House Committee on Labor earlier this month, Hatters' Union Secretary Coleman said that, since 1950, the number of U.S. hat body producers has shrunk from 15 to only 4 as domestic production has slumped from 646,260 dozen to 176,437 dozen in 1960. The number of imported hat bodies also was lower in 1960 than in 1950, 155,895 dozen against 255,969 dozen, but these foreign hat bodies last year were equal to 88.3 percent of domestic production, against only 40.2 percent in the earlier year.

Mr. Coleman conceded that a factor in the falloff in domestic hat body production has been the growing female practice of going hatless. But he insisted, "The extremely large amount of imports coming largely from Italy has continued to flood the U.S. market, and the domestic industry has continued to decline at a dramatic rate."

What Mr. Coleman neglected to mention in his prepared statement is that the union's Merrimac operation, by its own reckoning, now accounts for "about 60 percent" of domestic hat body production. (Other industry sources put Merrimac's share even higher—closer to 70 percent.) Or that Merrimac's own ruggedly competitive tactics may have been a factor in the demise of some of the U.S. hat body firms.

A BACKBREAKING TASK

Says Randal McLachlan, who closed his Danbury, Conn., hat body factory, George McLachlan & Sons, Inc., this spring, shortly after Merrimac stepped up its marketings of competing men's hat bodies: "It's as simple as this—Merrimac is making and delivering hat bodies for \$14.35 a dozen and I was breaking my back to make them for \$17.50."

Merrimac admittedly has lower wage rates than most of its competitors in the hat body field. Its average is presently about \$2.15 an hour, 10 to 20 cents lower than in Danbury and other hat centers. This differential existed before the union took over the management of Merrimac and has persisted since then, much to the dis-

dress of Merrimac's few remaining competitors.

"We certainly didn't expect the union would give us competition," grumbles one small hat-body producer. "When they took over in Amesbury, they said they were going to straighten out labor costs, but they never did."

There's some question about the status of the Hatters' Merrimac investment under the AFL-CIO ethical practices code, which forbids unions from investing in companies they bargain with. The Hatters have partially sidestepped the issue by having local 87 at Merrimac bargain with a team of three non-union company executives, though the union-dominated board must ratify any contract. (The workers received a 7½-percent raise when the union took over the company.) In addition, George Meany, president of the labor federation, has ruled the code provision is intended principally to prevent union officers from lining their own pockets to the detriment of their duties as labor leaders. And not even the Hatters' most bitter critics have accused Merrimac's new managers of profiting personally at the expense of either the company or the union.

Many milliners, meanwhile, question the value of "saving" the domestic hat-body business, at least at the price of restricting imports. They consider imported bodies a better buy for their price, and fret that the switch to what they consider inferior U.S.-made bodies will hurt sales.

MILLINERS' COMPLAINTS

"I'm known for making a quality product; how can I justify my price if I use a cheap piece of goods?" asks one milliner who specializes in hats with hand-finished touches. Another hat maker argues: "As a style business we should be entitled to use what we think is right for the product." Others fear the loss of the "imported" on the label will diminish the prestige of their hats. Nevertheless, for the fall season now getting under way, many milliners, including a number who have always used imported bodies, say they will buy only from Merrimac.

Significantly, Robert Lubin, sales agent for Alexander Hat Co. of Reading, Pa., Merrimac's only major domestic competitor in the women's hat-body field, asserts the union's antiimport campaign "hasn't helped me a bit."

Importers naturally are upset. "The union fails to tell the public on whose beard it shaved to accomplish its claimed 'salvation' of the hat body industry," complains Leonard Weintraub, president of the Importers Hat Body Association, a small trade group made up of about a half-dozen firms. He charges the union with "intimidating hat manufacturers indirectly and directly and forcing them to buy domestic hat bodies, even against their own wishes." The importers' loud complaints, in fact, prompted a Justice Department investigation of alleged restraint of trade in the industry last fall, but nothing came of it.

Meanwhile, the union's crusade against imports seems to be working. In the first 4 months of this year, imports of hat bodies in the \$6 to \$9 a dozen range, directly competitive with Merrimac's own line, dropped 44 percent below the 1960 period. Higher priced hat bodies, costing \$39 and up a dozen, are almost a foreign monopoly and are imported with little union opposition. However, importers some day may find trouble here, too, since Merrimac this year announced it was starting production of a higher priced line.

The union, moreover, is continuing to base its anti-import arguments heavily on the "poisonous mercury" theme, much to the distress of many milliners who fear that if women ever get wind of this idea they will give up wearing hats completely.

GLOSSIER HATS

Union Secretary Coleman, in a demonstration, places two felt hat bodies on his desk at the Hatters International headquarters in New York. One is green and the other blue. The green one, he notes, is glossier and softer to the touch.

"You know what the gimmick is; it's mercury," he asserts. This "gooey metal," he says, can affect a hat worker's central nervous system and give him the shakes. Indeed, says Mr. Coleman, its use caused Victorian England to believe all hatters were mad, a concept Lewis Carroll immortalized in Alice in Wonderland.

The evidence to document this claim is inconclusive. It's true that four States in the United States outlaw the use of mercury in hat body manufacturing, while many European countries permit it. But importers claim the mercury is used abroad only in fur processing, and by the time it arrives in a hat body is present in amounts too small to affect a worker's health.

Last year, in its bargaining with the Eastern Women's Headwear Association the principal millinery employers' group, the union was able to get a "sanitary clause" written into the standard contract, providing that employees shall not be required to work on or handle any articles which contain mercury or other "noxious, deleterious or poisonous substances."

There ensued what might be called the "battle of the testing laboratories." The union sent samples of imported hat bodies to one research lab, which discovered traces of mercury in all the samples. The union then declared its members "will not work on these poison hats."

IMPORTERS' COUNTERATTACK

The importers, in turn, sent a coded batch of sample hat bodies, its own and some of Merrimac's to another testing laboratory, which found in some cases the Merrimac hat body samples contained more mercury than the imported samples. The explanation, according to importers and Merrimac's rivals, was that Merrimac uses imported fur, treated with mercury, in making its hat bodies.

Another jolt for the union came when a labor arbitrator agreed in effect with the importers last fall when he dismissed a union complaint that the Yvette Hat Co. of New York was violating its contract with the Hatters by using mercury-treated bodies; he ruled there was no proof the workers' health was endangered. Importers also have circulated a 1954 statement from the U.S. Public Health Service that the Service knows of "no case where individuals engaged in blocking and trimming and other handling of such (mercury-treated) fur felt hat bodies have suffered any ill effects." The statement adds: "We also know of no ill effects which might occur to anyone wearing a hat made from a mercury-carroted (treated) fur body."

Despite the furor over mercury, the union in some cases freely allows its members to process mercury-bearing imported hat bodies, particularly higher-priced ones of a type not obtainable in the United States. Mr. Coleman admits this happens, and says, in explanation, "There are no notes to this symphony we're playing. There are half a hundred different reasons going at any one time that determine how hard we will be pushing against imports."

For all their grumbling about the union's "dominating, controlling attitude," as one manufacturer puts it, milliners concede they are not likely to fight back very strongly, because of their small size in relation to the union. It collects 10 percent of every hat-maker's payroll for its welfare fund, plus another 1 percent to help finance an industry promotion campaign.

With the welfare fund and other enterprises, the union has spent \$1 million since

1956 for what it calls direct aid to the industry. This includes the \$300,000 Merrimac investment, but the greater part of it is accounted for by union participation in the promotion campaign and loans to hat firms in Chicago, Baltimore, Massachusetts, and New York City.

The Hatters' Union even has a voice in determining some milliners' rents, since it took a first mortgage on a New York City building that houses some 40 millinery shops (it stipulated as part of the agreement that the rents would not be raised for 5 years). It also owns another building outright which houses millinery shops.

Your Forest Ranger

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEON H. GAVIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 1, 1961

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert in the RECORD a very interesting article written by Mr. L. E. Stotz, a U.S. forest ranger on the Allegheny National Forest, Warren, Pa.:

[From the Ridgway (Pa.) Record, July 28, 1961]

YOUR FOREST RANGER

(By L. E. Stotz)

Except for Twin Lakes and Loleta, which are under daily supervision by concessionaires, the recreation areas on the Allegheny National Forest are entirely dependent upon the cooperation of the users to prevent undue wear and tear on the improvements that have been placed there for their convenience and enjoyment.

One of the things that regular users of the campgrounds and picnic area like most is the informal atmosphere that prevails. Visitors are left to their own devices. In general, our faith in the innate goodness of people has been well founded. Most of them cooperate fully. A few do not. It is among the latter group that we find the following characters:

1. The "caveman" who fears the night and builds a fire large enough to keep saber-tooth tigers at bay. The troubles is, he usually builds it on top of a fireplace and the intense heat from his bonfire warps the metal grate and cracks the stonework around it.

2. The "muscleman" who insist upon moving picnic tables away from their designated locations, but who never move them back again when they are through with them.

3. The "handyman" who improvises outdoor furniture from poles and wire and who drives nails at eye level into trees from which he strings wire and rope. He never removes the nails after use and usually leaves some of the wire or rope dangling.

4. "Neanderthal man." This throwback from caveman days has traded his stone ax for a shiny metal one. Like a child with a new toy, he chops into live trees to see the chips fly.

5. The "bottle buster." The tinkle of broken glass charms him more than the song of a bird. He hates barefooted children and leaves in the grass and along stream edges a trail of broken glass on which children cut their feet.

6. The "initial carver." He never took to heart the old adage: "Fools' names like fools' faces always appear in public places." His

initials can be found etched into picnic tables and on shelter posts.

7. The "table burner." A rare species that occasionally run amuck at night smashing and burning picnic tables.

8. The "pushover." A vandal who thinks big. He tackles outside toilets, toppling them over and burning them.

8. The "pioneer." This type doesn't like to be fenced in. He resents wooden post or stone barriers designed to keep cars from running wild over recreation areas. He will exercise the greatest ingenuity to circumvent them.

10. The "sniper." Garbage cans and recreation area signs are big game to this intrepid hunter.

11. The "squatter." With house trailer or tent, he stakes a claim for the summer on a public campground thus monopolizing a site that others might enjoy for overnight camping.

12. The "cyclone." After he has camped or picnicked, the area looks as though a cyclone had struck. The ground is littered with paper plates, watermelon rinds, corn husks, tin cans, and bottles.

13. The "strawman." He leaves a pile of moldy straw wherever he has camped for he never cleans up the bales of hay that he has spread on the ground for his bed.

It is this small group of unthinking and destructive campers and picnickers who make repair and replacement costs so high on national-forest recreation areas. Because of them, some of the money that could have been used for the development of new recreation areas and the improvement of others has been drained away for the repair and replacement of existing improvements.

High-Flying Aviation Agency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 26, 1961

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, a most significant editorial pointing up the need for a local voice in such a vital matter as the safety and welfare of the people affected by the location of an airport, appeared recently in the Long Island Daily Press. This editorial highlights the need for a curb on such arbitrary action as manifested by the FAA in the matter of Mitchel Field. I heartily compliment the Long Island Daily Press on this forthright editorial which I am certain clearly reflects the views of the people of Long Island who have been suffering so undeservedly from the noise menace and other hazards of low-flying planes.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the editorial to my colleagues and ask permission to insert it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

HIGH-FLYING AVIATION AGENCY

The Federal Aviation Agency takes a mighty high-flying attitude by insisting on a general airport at Mitchel Field.

FAA flies in the face of public interest and commonsense.

The Air Force abandoned Mitchel Field as unsuitable in a heavily populated area.

Long Island needs the acreage for other uses—an expanded Hofstra College, Nassau Community College, possibly a Veterans' Administration hospital, and a medical college.

The FAA's stand is that it has first claim on the property and will use it as a general

airport, or a good part of it, or nobody else will get it at all. The only question here is: Does FAA have power to exercise its will over a community in such a situation? We certainly hope not.

Public sentiment generally and Long Island's congressional bloc solidly oppose an airport at Mitchel Field. It just isn't the place; the acreage is needed for other community needs.

The FAA says it will adhere to its plans "until a superior alternative is offered." What cynicism. The superior alternative, of course, is the planned development of Mitchel Field—without an airport.

The Trucking Industry Replies to Life Magazine Editorial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 12, 1961

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, recently, there appeared an article in Life magazine titled "Danger to the Railroads," which was inserted in the Appendix of the June 12, 1961, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

At the request of several of my constituents engaged in the trucking industry, I have been asked to insert the following reply which appeared in the June 26, 1961, issue of Transport Topics, the national newspaper of the motor freight carriers:

ATA LETTER TO LIFE EXPOSES ERRORS OF FACT IN ITS EDITORIAL

(The following is excerpted from a letter written to the chief editorial writer of Life magazine by Walter W. Belson, assistant to the president, American Trucking Associations, in protest to the inaccuracy of an editorial printed in the June 9 edition of Life. The editors of Life have agreed to publish a much smaller excerpt of the letter in their issue of this week.)

Will a great national publication use its editorial page to admit it is wrong—when it is wrong?

Or does its power over a huge audience and its leadership disposition to speak ex cathedra on public affairs make it shrink from such admission? Here is a question which goes to the heart of the integrity of such a publication. It happens that Life can give the answer—and I believe it is big enough to give the right answer.

Your editorial "Danger to the Railroads" (June 9) is so harmful to the trucking industry, that had it been concerned with an individual rather than a collective industry, I am sure it would constitute a cause of action for false and defamatory statements.

I am not sure that you are aware that your editorial projects your influence into a legislative battle before the Congress, but it does. The damage to our industry arises from your seriously inaccurate statement of the terms of rate competition between railroads and trucks. The statement, if true, would justify your position in part. If untrue, as it is, it damages severely our industry and invalidates a part of your argument. As to the defamatory implications, they go to the same point.

Under the subhead "Unfair Regulations" your editorial repeats a false statement continuously made by railroad propagandists. You say "truck and barge operators, on the

other hand, may set any rates the traffic will bear and can change them at will."

This statement is false.

A single call to the Chairman, any member of the Interstate Commerce Commission or its public information section would have given you the truth. The truth is that the motor common carrier, the principal for-hire truck competitor of the railroads, is regulated in precisely the same terms and to the same extent as the railroads, and in the words of an ICC report, is, if anything, more stringently regulated. Beyond ICC regulation, it is a fact that local and State regulations on size, weight, length, speed, and safety requirements give the motor carrier a regulatory straightjacket far more confining than the rails. A copy of the Motor Carrier Act is enclosed.

It has been a favorite propaganda contention of the railroads that they are regulated and their competitors run wild; that they suffer from "archaic regulations" imposed when they were a monopoly and that they no longer are; that the "dead hand" of regulation stifles railroad managerial discretion. Your editorial advances that thesis and the particular inaccuracy complained of does the damage.

What is the truth?

I am enclosing a full copy of a talk made by the Honorable Anthony Arpaia before the Third Michigan Railroad Seminar at Ann Arbor, Mich., in February of 1957. Conditions described then are since unchanged except for a further beneficial attitude toward rails in rate matters developed by the ICC in a mistaken interpretation of the Transportation Act of 1958. Mr. Arpaia at the time of his address was a member of the ICC. His statement was not unique—it has been voiced by many ICC authorities. You will find . . . this comment (in the Arpaia talk):

"Railroads alone file with the (ICC) an average of over 3,000 rate changes every working day of the year. During the year 1956 (last full year at the time of his talk), how many rates out of the million or more rate changes filed by railroads were adjudged to be unlawful by the Commission after protest by competing forms of transportation? Ten thousand? Two thousand? One thousand? One hundred? No. Just exactly 12.

"EFFECT OF RATES ON TRAFFIC"

"Now, how much traffic was involved in these 12 cases? In other words, how badly hurt were the railroads by our finding that these rate changes were unlawful? If they had been able to obtain every single pound of the traffic involved, from competing forms of transportation, which, of course, is hardly likely, they would have added only \$1,228,879 to their gross revenue; \$1,109,359 of this amount from water carriers and a mere \$119,520 from motor competitors. This represents only eleven-thousandths of 1 percent of the total revenue of railroads for the year 1956."

Does that surprise you? Does that sound as if the railroads are frustrated in their effort to set rates? It could have been discovered, along with the fact that motor common carrier trucks are subject to precisely the same rate, route, and service regulation as the railroads, by the single call to the ICC.

That false statement, expressed in the same factually careless manner so familiar in railroad arguments, has done a great disservice to the trucking industry. The reason is that railroads are now campaigning for a program of deregulation, common ownership, and other special privilege which, if successful, will wreck the trucking industry and bring transportation inefficiency and chaos to our economy. Your editorial progresses that lobbying campaign most effectively.

Your editorial advocacy of a program by which "We could get more of the freight

'boxcars' off the highways, where they inconvenience and imperil the public, onto railroad 'piggybacks' which can haul them most places cheaper" defames the trucking industry. The implication clearly is that our "boxcars" are especially dangerous. The fact, ascertainable from National Safety Council or any other reputable body is that the record of the trucking industry is greatly superior to that of the passenger car. The last figures available (for 1959) show that trucks as a whole, comprising 16 percent of all registered vehicles, compose only 11 percent of vehicles involved in traffic accidents, a remarkable figure when it is realized that these vehicles operate under all weather conditions when passenger car owners have the option of keeping cars off the streets and roads, and exercise it widely.

MINUTE ACCIDENT RATIO

Specifically, as to these "boxcars," if you will consult the National Safety Council you will find that our intercity common carrier units, competitive with the rails, have an accident ratio of 0.058 per 100,000 miles as compared with the passenger car rate of 1.4 per 100,000 miles or twice as good.

We have spent millions of dollars and an aggregate of many millions of hours of time in driver training, inculcation of highway courtesy, and safety education to produce the superior performance just mentioned. We deserve better than the defamatory implications of "boxcars" imperiling the public in their conventional use of roads for which this industry pays for the right to operate.

Your editorial is not only inaccurate and very harmful to the trucking industry, in tone, but it is also baffling to those of us who are familiar with Life. The quality of your editorial personnel and of your research resources makes it almost unbelievable that you could come up with the kind of analysis of transportation reflected in your editorial.

Whether anyone likes it or not, the railroads are the victims of a technological obsolescence. At one time the economic structure of this country was such that railroads had an ideal opportunity to become strong and healthy. In fact they were the key to growth, for along their tracks cities grew as industries developed, and products of land, mine, and forest moved to market.

VICTIM OF BAD PLANNING

Had their construction been planned on an engineering and economic basis rather than as stock promotion and stock jobbing enterprises, they would have been supremely strong and healthy business enterprises in their early and middle years. Not only that, but they would now have a complex of tracks devoid of duplication and with promise of fairly easy accommodation to the changing terms of transportation requirements, particularly the line haul in conjunction with other modes.

But they were not so built, and having been born out of economic wedlock they have never, as a whole, since the very beginning, enjoyed the status in transportation which their performance and potential might have entitled them to occupy. In addition they have been inconstant trouble with huge mileages frequently in bankruptcy or receivership over the years. You should note with interest at this time, and for the first time in many years, no mileage is in bankruptcy or receivership so far as I know—and you might balance this against your belief they are in special trouble currently.

Your mention of the decline in the railroad percentage of intercity freight, intended to make some kind of strong point, is actually meaningless. Did you or anyone else expect with the emergence of newer, and for many purposes better, transport facilities, the railroads could maintain a traditional slice of the total pie—a slice which was theirs only because they were at one time the only mechanical land transport available?

What does the declining share signify? A steady attrition of their total freight traffic volume? If that is what you were conveying, and it seems clearly to be, you have done a disservice to readers interested in the truth. For the fact is that while the railroads' relative share is declining percentage-wise, their actual volume hauled is far above their total of all but the war years.

The year 1929 was their greatest volume-of-freight-traffic year, except for some abnormal years during World War II. In 1929 they handled 450 billion ton-miles and did it with a work force of just over 1,800,000 employees. But, their average for the past 5 years has been 606 billion ton-miles, handled with less than half as many employees. Now how important is their decline of percentage of the total business?

RIGIDITY AN OBSTACLE

Let us return to technological obsolescence. The hard facts are that the railroads, tied as they are to the inflexible route patterns laid out from 50 to 100 or more years ago, are no longer responsive to either the geography or the requirements of a great deal of our manufacturing complex. They are rigid—not flexible.

They just don't go where the business is—as once they did nearly 100 percent. That's the hard fact of progress which they face and that's at the bottom of their problem.

The remedy for railroad rigidity seems to have escaped your attention. It is one long advocated by transportation experts and endorsed by the trucking industry. It is called coordination of transportation. Under such a program, railroads would make joint rate and service arrangements with motor carriers, just as they do with each other, and traffic would move freely by truck-rail arrangements where such were of economic or service value to the shipper. Truckline salesmen could "sell" coordinating rail service and rail solicitors could do the same for truck service. The trucking industry already has such arrangements with air freight and they work out successfully.

We think the main reason for rail failure to coordinate goes to the problem raised in your editorial when you described railroad management as "often inefficient" and said that it "pursues archaic and unreliable methods." This is an example. They want to own and operate the Nation's transport or they won't play—a rule or ruin policy which hurts them and the shipping public as well as our own industry.

Another surprisingly limited viewpoint expressed in your editorial which excites our speculation as to just how thoroughly you investigated the movement of freight or passengers today, has to do with the so-called efficiency of the rails.

Your comment that "per employee they can carry six times as much freight as trucks, and per gallon of fuel three times as much" is economically meaningless to more and more shippers as time goes on. A case in point: Why don't you use rail carload freight service to deliver Life and Time magazines, if the advantages you mention are persuasive? You don't of course—you use a good deal of truck service. What makes you believe that your problem in this area is so much different than modern manufacturers of a great variety of items?

You can produce the same apparently stunning cost figures on the movement intercity of people. Five hundred of them can be loaded into a passenger train in New York and hauled to Chicago, for example, far, far cheaper than if they used their private automobiles. There is only one problem—people prefer to use their cars for this purpose for a variety of reasons which overwhelm the thought of piling into a train and taking advantage of the unquestioned economy of such mass movement. So, as I say, your

reference to costs in this connection is meaningless—worse it is very misleading when you stop where you did.

ADDED TRAFFIC THEORY

Your editorial would cure the railroad problem by taking "ICC control off their floor prices." You may not be aware of it but this is the added traffic theory and it goes like this: Make it possible for the railroads to get greater volume through permission to drop their rates to any point they find necessary to do so, and lo and behold they will build up big profits with which to modernize, experiment, improve management, etc.

This theory has within it the old fatuity about losing money on every item but making it up by volume. It has the further defect pointed out above—cut rates alone will not procure certain traffic. Motor carrier rates now are generally above rail. Finally let me point out that this theory collapses in the face of one hard fact which you have overlooked: Railroads have added one-third to their ton-mile performance since 1929, as noted, and handle it with a smaller physical plant and 50 percent fewer employees and are still, you say, in trouble. Here is the added traffic theory at work—an increase of one-third in volume with the same facilities and fewer personnel—and it doesn't seem to work does it? Moreover it has been accomplished under protective regulatory supervision which has allowed them to go down to out-of-pocket costs as a rate bottom. One can only imagine what their distress might be if they had had a free hand in setting a bottom to their rates.

"GLAMOUR" AIDS RAILROADS

The glamour of the railroads and the momentum of their past importance has carried over today into attitudes which your editorial, and others, express. Our industry, composed as it is of so many small business organizations, achieves its great economic impact through the cumulative efforts of a great many, rather than the few railroads represented by the 100 odd trunk lines.

As always, we are entirely agreeable to discussing this or any other subject involving our industry with Life editorial or policy personnel, either here or in New York and at your convenience.

Both the operating side of this industry, and I am confident the supplying industry side, will be hopeful that you see fit, editorially, to correct errors and to repair to the extent possible, some of the real damage which your comment has done this and related industries.

National Gallery of Art

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 31, 1961

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, the National Gallery of Art with its many cultural services, is such a treat that I believe that the American people will be more than pleased with the fine events, tours, films, and lectures, that are available and planned for the month of August 1961. I am therefore submitting these for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

NATIONAL GALLERY OF ART—AUGUST 1961
CALENDAR OF EVENTS

Gallery hours: Weekdays 10 a.m. to 5 p.m.
Sunday 2 p.m. to 10 p.m. Admission is free to the gallery and to all programs scheduled.